DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 709 JC 760 384

AUTHOR	Feldman, Sylvia D.
TITLE	Trends in Offender Vocational and Education Programs: A Literature Search with Program Development Guidelines.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	30 Jan 75
NOTE	89p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Correctional Education; Federal Aid; Financial Support; Junior Colleges; *Literature Reviews; *Post Secondary Education; *Prisoners; *Program Development; *Program Guides; Program Planning
IDENTIFIERS	Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Grants

ABSTRACT

The American penal system of placing criminal offenders in institutions has evolved from two major goals: (1) to punish offenders as an example to the rest of the community, and (2) to rehabilitate offenders into the community. Since the mid-1960's there has been a trend toward placing offenders in the community and away from isolating them in penal institutions. This paper is concerned with this trend as it relates to training and education programs for offenders. The author reviews the literature pertaining to pretrial intervention and diversion programs and to post-conviction programs. She also presents guidelines to assist interested individuals and groups in planning, designing, and establishing community education programs for offenders, in gaining community support, and in program finance and evaluation. An extensive bibliography is appended, as are a list of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) grants awarded for programs relating to pretrial release and educational release during fiscal years 1972-74, and a list of the two- and four-year colleges presently conducting higher education programs in State and Federal penal institutions. (DC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125709

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TRENDS IN OFFENDER VOCATIONAL AND EDUCATION PROGRAMS: A LITERATURE SEARCH WITH PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES

Sylvia D. Feldman
January 30, 1975

VT 760 384

The purpose of the paper is to describe the various criminal justice diversion and alternative programs which have been conducted in this country in the last five years and those which are currently running. The common characteristic of these programs is a focus on educational and vocational training as rehabilitation-reintegration devices. A second purpose of this paper is to set-out general guidelines for the development of community-based correctional education programs for the benefit of those who are interested in establishing such projects.

The appendices contain references to a wide variety of related projects. Program descriptions of many of these projects are available in the Offender Assistance project office at AACJC. Those available are noted.

This paper was commissioned as a part of the AACJC project: Offender Assistance Through Community Colleges. The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, U. S. Office of Education, awarded the planning grant, #OEG-0-74-9064. The findings, opinions, and conclusions expressed in this work are solely those of the author and editor and do not necessarily reflect nor can be inferred as being the official position of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

James R. Mahoney, Project Director, edited the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Diversions and Alternatives - The Problem of Terminology	4
Pretrial Intervention and Diversion Programs	8
Post Conviction Programs	10
Occupational Programs	11
Occupational Program Sources	12
Occupational Program Locations	13
Education Programs	13
Summary	16
Planning a Program	17
Selection	17
Program Design	19
Community Support	20
Publicity	22
Financing	23
Evaluation	26
Conclusion	29
Footnotes	31
Appendices	
LEAA Grants Relating to First Offenders, Fiscal Years 1969-1974	49
LEAA Grants Relating to Pre-Trial Release and Educational Release, Fiscal Years 1972-1974	57
Higher Education Programs in State and Federal Penal Institutions During the 1972-1973 Academic Year	76
Bibliography	
Articles, Books, Speeches	87

I.

Introduction

The American penal system has evolved from two major goals. The first derived originally from the centuries-old belief in the value of punishment as a way of insuring ". . .the integrity of the rest of society providing the public reaffirmation of values."[1] Punishing the criminal was meant to serve two purposes: to be "a threat and deterrent to potential lawbreakers"[2] and to be a means of regeneration for the criminal by bringing about his repentance and so cleansing his soul. A belief in the value of punishment is still current today. It is the foundation upon which jails and prisons are built and filled. It is the premise upon which convicted offenders justify their sentences when they say, "If you play, you gotta pay."[3] Although the goal of punishment may succeed, it is clear that it neither deters others nor regenerates offenders. As the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals points out:

> The failure of major institutions to reduce crime is incontestable. Recidivism rates are notoriously high. Institutions do succeed in punishing, but they do not deter. They protect the community, but that protection is only temporary. They relieve the community of responsibility by removing the offender, but they make successful reintegration into the community unlikely. They change the committed offender, but the change is more likely to be negative that positive.[4]

The second goal of the American penal system, which grew out of the movements for reform during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, is based on the assumption that rehabilitation is a way of ". . .turning troublesome lawbreakers into respectable adherents of traditional values."[5] Prisons are not only meant to safeguard society by isolating offenders but are meant as well to be mechanisms for change. Those to be rehabilitated are perceived as misfits: persons who are either psychologically maladjusted or inadequately prepared vocationally and educationally to adapt to the needs and values of society. Theoretically, during the period of their incarceration, inmates can be "cured" or educated so that when they return to society they are willing and able to function as law-abiding citizens. Counselling, therapy, in-prison vocational and educational programs - all these are designed to prepare inmates to cope with "the free world."

Rehabilitation through incarceration has not achieved the results which its champions envisioned. It has been estimated that anywhere from one-third to more than two-thirds of those incarcerated return to prison again.[6]

To some extent, the failure of in-prison rehabilitation programs may be due to a conflict between the goals of punishment and rehabilitation. It is doubtful that rehabilitation and punishment can be achieved simultaneously. In addition, while punishment may no longer be a "fashionable" goal, as the American Friends Service report on

crime states, too often ". . .the punitive spirit has survived unscathed behind the mask of treatment."[7] As a result, the goal of rehabilitation is often undermined rather than supported. In her study of women in prison, for example, Kathryn Burkhart found that "Even the most conservative penologists admit privately that jobs in prison don't have any significant relationship to rehabilitation."[8]

A further difficulty is that offenders who take part in prison rehabilitation programs are often isolated for long periods of time from the very communities in which they are expected to adjust. Their lives in prison have a rhythm very different from that in the free world. In-prison experience and training are minimally effective in preparing inmates for the abrupt adjustment necessitated by their return to society.

Since the mid-1960's there has been a growing tendency away from the isolation of offenders in penal institutions and toward their placement in the community. In 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice praised programs located in the community because "The available evidence indicates that these programs are achieving higher success rates than the institutional alternatives, and at a substantially lower cost."[9] This Commission recommended that "Correctional authorities should develop more extensive community programs providing special, intensive treatment as an alternative to institutionalization for both juvenile and adult offenders."[10]

In its 1973 report, A National Strategy to Reduce Crime, the National Advisory Commission emphasized even more strongly the need to develop more community-based programs for offenders:

> There are compelling reasons to continue the move away from institutions. First, State institutions consume more that three-fourths of all expenditures for corrections while dealing with less than one-third of all offenders. Second, as a whole they do not deal with those offenders effectively. There is no evidence that prisons reduce the amount of crime. On the contrary, there is evidence that they contribute to criminal activity after the inmate is released.
>
> Prisons tend to dehumanize people - turning them from individuals into mere numbers. Their weaknesses are made worse, and their capacity for responsibility and self-government is eroded by regimentation. Add to these facts the physical and mental conditions resulting from overcrowding and from the various ways in which institutions ignore the rights of offenders, and the riots of the past decade are hardly to be wondered at. Safety for society may be achieved for a limited time if offenders are kept out of circulation, but no real public protection is provided if confinement serves mainly to prepare men for more, and more skilled, criminality.[11]

The Commission recommended that:

> States should refrain from building any more State institutions for juveniles; States should phase out present institutions over a 5-year period. They should also refrain from building more State institutions for adults for the next 10 years except when total system planning shows that the need for them is imperative.[12]

The Commission concluded that ". . .the most helpful move toward effective corrections is to continue and strengthen the trend away from confining people in institutions and toward supervising them in the community."[13] It is this trend - as it affects training and education programs - with which this paper is concerned.

Before surveying these programs, however, it may be helpful to review briefly the characteristics of those most likely to be arrested, convicted, and incarcerated.

In a 1973 report on Federal prisons made to the Congress by the Comptroller General, Bureau of Prisons officials estimated that of the inmates in Federal institutions:

--15 percent read below the sixth-grade level.
--90 percent have not completed high school.
--88 percent have undesirable character traits.
--65 percent have no marketable skills.[14]

The National Advisory Commission reported that ". . .the average offender, particularly the offender who serves a term of imprisonment, is a loser in the world of work."[15]

In addition, the Commission reported that "More than 90 percent of those arrested for violent crimes and burglaries in 1971 were males."[16] Although the number of women arrested continues to grow[17], the proportion of women arrested and incarcerated is still relatively small. In From Convict to Citizen, Virginia McArthur stated, for example, that "Of the 6.5 million arrestees in 1970, only 1 in 7 was a female," and that only 1 in 22 were incarcerated. Therefore, women "account for 15 percent of all arrests" but only "five percent of the incarcerated population."[18] Women prisoners, like men, tend to be under-educated and un- or under-employed. Ms. McArthur found that approximately 30 percent of the women in prison were on welfare before their incarceration and that as many as 80 percent of them have dependent children.[19]

She further indicated that members of minority groups are more likely to be arrested and convicted. For example, in a study of the D.C. Women's Detention Center, it was found that "first bookings in the Women's Detention Center are 73% black" and that "cases sentenced for 30 days or more are 92% black, and cases sentenced for three months or longer are 97% black."[20] This pattern of high arrest and incarceration rates for minorities was also pointed out by the National Advisory Commission. In A National Strategy to Reduce Crime, the Commission reported that "More

than one-half of those arrested for violent crimes in 1971 were non-whites, most blacks."[21] The Commission cited the Federal Bureau of Prisons figures for 1972, which showed that ". . .the average sentence of all persons committed to Federal Prisons was 43.3 months for whites and 58.7 months for blacks."[22] In its volume Corrections, the Commission concluded that "Minority groups have consistently been disproportionately represented in correctional institutions as compared to their overall representation in society."[23]

To summarize, both male and female offenders tend to be poor, under-educated, and un- or under-employed; they are most often members of minority groups. They tend to come from the lower economic and social levels of American society. Hampered by discrimination, limited education and inadequate occupational skills, they often find crime an attractive alternative to a life of poverty.

II.

Diversions and Alternatives - The Problem of Terminology

A precise definition of what constitutes an alternative in the criminal justice system has not yet been established. The term is usually employed in its broadest sense, combining two standard dictionary definitions:

> "a proposition or situation offering a choice between two things, wherein if one thing is chosen the other is rejected"

or, in the case of more than two:

> "one of a number of things or courses offered for choice."[24]

The danger of using a generalized term is suggested by Raymond T. Nimmer in Diversion - The Search for Alternative Forms of Prosecution. Writing of the generalized use of "diversion", he stated that too frequently the term has been used "to describe various ideas that have little more in common than that they propose to alter current criminal justice practices."[25]

The attempt to define "diversion" more precisely has led to the development of four related, although somewhat varying, definitions by the National Advisory Commission. The broadest is that suggested in Police:

> Every police agency, where permitted by law, immediately should divert from the criminal and juvenile justice systems any individual who comes to the attention of the police, and for whom the purpose of the criminal or

> juvenile process would be inappropriate, or in whose case other resources would be more effective. All diversion dispositions should be made pursuant to written agency policy that insures fairness and uniformity of treatment.[26]

In Community Crime Prevention, "diversion" is defined primarily in terms of juveniles:

> Diversion is defined in this discussion as the process whereby problems otherwise dealt with in a context of delinquency and official action will be defined and handled by other nonjustice system means.[27]

The most limiting definition is found in Courts:

> The term, "diversion," as used in this report, refers to halting or suspending before conviction formal criminal proceedings against a person on the condition or assumption that he will do something in return. Screening, on the other hand, involves the cessation of formal criminal proceedings and removal of the individual from the criminal justice system. Action taken after conviction is not diversion, because at that point the criminal prosecution already has been permitted to proceed to its conclusion, the determination of criminal guilt.[28]

A broader but at the same time a more precise definition than those found in Police and Community Crime Prevention, is the definition in Corrections:

> . . ."diversion" refers to formally acknowledged and organized efforts to utilize alternatives to initial or continued processing into the justice system. To qualify as diversion, such efforts must be undertaken prior to adjudication and after a legally prescribed action has occurred.
>
> In terms of process, diversion implies halting or suspending formal criminal or juvenile justice proceedings against a person who has violated a statute, in favor of processing through a noncriminal disposition or means.
>
> Diversion is differentiated from prevention in that the latter refers to efforts to avoid or prevent behavior in violation of statute, while diversion concerns efforts after a legally prescribed action has occurred. . .

> Diversion is also differentiated from the concept of "minimizing penetration" in that the latter refers to efforts to utilize less drastic means or alternatives at any point throughout official criminal or juvenile justice processing, while diversion attempts to avoid or halt official processing altogether.[29]

It is the definition in Corrections which the American Bar Foundation followed most closely when it defined the term in Diversion - The Search for Alternative Forms of Prosecution:

> Diversion, as used in this report, is the disposition of a criminal complaint without a conviction, the noncriminal disposition being conditioned on either the performance of specified obligations by the defendant, or his participation in counselling or treatment. A diversion program is an enterprise that recurrently arranges conditional, noncriminal dispositions whether or not they are in fact obtained for all defendants complying with the stated conditions.[30]

This "operational definition" was developed by the ABF as one which "encompassed most of the currently popular activity but was sufficiently specific to isolate activities with similar rationale and content."[31]

Other than "probation", little terminology yet exists to describe activities which occur after sentencing and in lieu of incarceration. In Corrections, the National Advisory Commission predicted that ". . . probation will become the standard sentence in criminal cases."[32] As the use of probation grows, more precise distinctions will have to be made between its various forms. Probation itself is now an omnibus term encompassing the numerous and differing ways courts can establish formal oversight of convicted offenders who are not imprisoned. It can refer to a disposition, a status, a system or subsystem, and a process.[33]

In Standards Relating to Probation, the American Bar Association Advisory Committee on Sentencing and Review offered guidance in developing more precise distinctions between types of post-trial sentences which do not involve incarceration. The Committee defined "probation" as: ". . .a sentence not involving confinement which imposes conditions and retains authority in the sentencing court to modify the conditions of the sentence or to resentence the offender if he violates the conditions. Such a sentence should not involve or require suspension of the imposition or the execution of any other sentence."[34]

Although the Committee chose "to treat numerous possibly different sentences under the single label of 'probation,'"[35] it noted that the New York statute "establishes three types of releases involving no imprisonment: probation, conditional discharge and unconditional discharge. Probation is a conditional release into the community, accompanied by appropriate supervision by a probation officer. . . .Conditional discharge similarly involves a release into the community on

conditions fixed by the court, but does not call for supervision. . . . Unconditional discharge involves what the name implies, a release into the community without conditions and without supervision."[36] The Committee recognized that ". . .each of these types of sentences deserves a place in a modern penal code" but found that conditional release is a form of probation since, in its view, "Supervision and its nature in a given case is viewed not as the differential which distinguishes one type of sentence from another, but as one of the incidents of probation, to be imposed or not as the situation dictates."[37] Nevertheless, differences between the definitions given in the Statutue and by the Committee argue for more precise terminology.

Despite the fact that "alternative" is now usually employed in a generalized sense, Senate Bill 798, which is concerned with reducing recidivisim ". . .by providing community-centered programs of supervision and services for persons charged with offenses against the United States. . ."[38], implies that "alternative" will take on a more precise meaning in criminal justice terminology. Section 2 of S. 798 finds that

> . . .the interests of protecting society and rehabilitating individuals charged with violating criminal laws can best be served by creating new and innovative alternatives for treatment and supervision within the community; that in many cases, society can best be served by diverting the accused to a voluntary community-oriented correctional program; that such diversion can be accomplished in appropriate cases without losing the general deterrent effect of the criminal justice system; that the retention of the deferred charges will serve both as a deterrent to committing further offenses and as an incentive to complete rehabilitative efforts; and that alternatives to institutionalization which provide for the educational, vocational, and social needs of the accused will equip him to lead a lawful and useful life.[39] (Emphasis added)

In this bill, then, "alternative" - although used with reference to "diversion" - is not employed in a generalized way but rather refers specifically to community-based conditional release. Since "diversion" is now the accepted term for conditional releases which occur prior to trial, it would seem to be more useful to the field of corrections to limit "alternative" to post-trial conditional releases. The arguments presented by the American Bar Association Advisory Committee and Section 2 of Senate Bill 798 suggest the direction a definition of "alternative" might take:

> "Alternative" is a form of probation whereby an offender is released into a community-based program which will improve her/his vocational, educational, and/or social skills so that upon completion of the program the offender is prepared to lead a non-criminal, self-fulfilling, and socially acceptable life.

III.

Pretrial Intervention and Diversion Programs

One of the most active areas of experimentation in the criminal justice system is pretrial intervention and diversion.

This activity is a response to the difficulties facing the criminal justice system. The large increase in reported crime has led to increasingly overcrowded dockets. The National Advisory Commission concluded that, "The criminal court system in the United States, which should bring swift and sure justice, has broken down under the burden of increased business while trying to operate under outmoded practices."[40] The result of the increase in cases to be tried is additional cost not only to the court system, which is already underfinanced[41], but to the entire criminal justice system as well.

As a result, a great interest has developed in discovering ways to relieve court dockets and to cut down the cost of the criminal justice system while improving rehabilitation programs. Pretrial intervention and diversion provide one method.

According to the National Pretrial Intervention Service Center of the American Bar Association, the "early diversion" movement dates back to the late 1960's.[42] Involvement in such programs has continued to grow. In its 1974 Source Book, the Pretrial Intervention Service Center lists 57 programs, an inventory "purposely narrowed to include only the listing of demonstrations patterned after the U.S. Department of Labor pretrial intervention manpower service model."[43] In addition, both the House of Representatives and the Senate have drawn up bills - H.R. 9007 and S. 798 - to provide for pretrial community-centered programs of supervision and services as a way of reducing recidivism. These bills, however, are now in Committee and it is unlikely that a joint bill will be passed by Congress within the near future - not because there is no support for such a bill but, rather, because at this point the Office of the Attorney General has recommended that more can be done informally, without legislation, and the Congressional committees have accepted this recommendation.[44]

Selection Criteria. The pretrial programs that have been developed concentrate upon those arrestees who appear to have the greatest potential for rehabilitation. In general, this means that the programs tend to concentrate upon the young. For example, of the ten programs described in the Portfolio of the National Pretrial Intervention Service Center, all accept persons in their middle or late teens, but only two (the North Bay Human Development Corporation and Project Crossroads) accept persons up to the age of 45, and only one (the Hudson County Pretrial Intervention Project) mentions no maximum age limit.

In addition, candidates for pretrial programs are usually either first offenders or those charged with misdemeanors or non-violent felonies. The Manhattan Court Employment Project, which has served as a model for numerous other programs, listed as ineligible those charged with homicide, rape, kidnapping or arson. The Accelerated Rehabilitation Disposition program in Philadelphia and the Deferred Prosecution Program in Genesee County, Michigan, are limited to those who have not committed crimes of violence.

A person's previous record affects his eligibility. Some programs, such as Project F.O.U.N.D., are restricted to first offenders with no prior arrest record. Others eliminate those who have extensive records. The Atlanta Pre-Trial Project, for instance, requires that participants have less than six months of previous incarceration, while the Boston Court Resources Project requires that participants have no more than two prior convictions, excluding petty traffic violations.

Most programs do not accept drug addicts, although a few, like Project Crossroads, accept persons charged with misdemeanor crimes such as possession of marijuana, amphetamines, and barbituates. In general, however, treatment programs for those charged with drug offenses tend to be handled separately. The Boston program, for example, diverts drug-related offenders to a drug treatment center.[45] A pretrial narcotics diversion program initiated in Washington, D.C. early in 1974 provides extended treatment for hard drug addicts who are either adult first offenders or who have records of non-violent crimes. After pleading guilty to the crime for which they were arrested, contracts are drawn up between defendants and the court in which the defendants agree to go through a ten-month treatment program administered by the Narcotics Administration. If the defendants finish the program satisfactorily, the guilty pleas are withdrawn and the cases are nulled.[46]

The Program. Much of the experimentation in pretrial programs develops from the awareness that offenders tend to be undereducated and either un- or under-employed. Such programs concentrate upon improving the educational and/or vocational skills and opportunities of their participants. For example, to cite only a few: the Manhattan Court Employment Project, in addition to offering counselling, offers "job training or academic placement with the help of Career Developers who aid participants in formulating clearcut vocational objectives and refer them to appropriate places of employment, training, or schooling." These career developers create a pool of available jobs and record a "participant's vocational progress during his three months in the project."[47] Project Crossroads offers its participants employment services and screens employers, while remedial education is provided through the involvement of VISTA and other volunteers. The Baltimore Pretrial Intervention Project and the DeNovo Project provide counselling and help with finding employment as well as offering remedial, basic, and GED courses. Baltimore's Project F.O.U.N.D., on the other hand, concentrates upon providing vocational training and education, including remedial and GED classes as well as some college preparatory tutoring.

Not until approximately a month before participants have completed their training does the job developer try to place them. It is worth noting that although many programs offer their own educational classes, some - such as the Dade County Pretrial Intervention Project and the Syracuse Court Rehabilitation Project - refer participants to community resources.

Many programs emphasizing vocational counselling, training and placement also include the improvement of participants' educational level as part of their concern. Focus is placed upon skills development in handling simple mathematical problems, communicating at least simple ideas on paper, and reading at least on an eighth grade level. These efforts are based on the assumption that earning capacity is limited by a lack of education.

Program Results. The results of these pretrial intervention and diversion programs appear encouraging. For example, the rate of employment for those participants who completed the Manhattan Project was 91.4 percent in the first year, 95.4 percent in the second, and 79.3 percent in the third, during a tight job market.[48] Project Crossroads claims that 49 percent of their unemployed referrals find jobs and 22 percent receive an increase in wages.[49] The recidivism rate for those successful participants of Baltimore's Pretrial Intervention Project is only 8.9 percent.[50] The Dade County project reports a recidivism rate of only 3 percent, with 45 percent of successful participants employed and 30 percent enrolled in school.[51]

Evaluation. The reasons for the success of these programs are not yet fully understood. To some extent, it may have something to do with participant selection; that is, those selected were most likely to be successful even without a program. Unfortunately, little comparative data exists, since of the ten programs listed in the Portfolio, only two (Dade County and Project DeNovo) used control groups and only one (Project Crossroads) used a "retrospective" control sample. It is possible, in addition, that the evaluation design and process may have affected the way in which data have been interpreted. The uncertainty of results argues for the need of including in all future efforts a carefully prepared experimental evaluation design.

Even without such a design, however, the apparent impact of these programs remains impressive.

IV.

Post Conviction Programs

In the honest politician's guide to crime control, (1970), Norval Morris and Gordon Hawkins reported that although "four-fifths of the correctional budget is spent and nine-tenths of correctional employees

work in penal institutions, only one-third of all offenders are confined in them."[52] While the National Advisory Commission generally accepted these figures, in A National Strategy to Reduce Crime, the Commission pointed out that more recent data (such as the 1970 National Jail Census) indicated a decline in inmate population. The Commission estimated that as of 1973 approximately three-fourths of convicted felons were "under supervision in the community"[53]; therefore, only one-fourth are now incarcerated.

This decline of inmate population is a continuing trend in corrections. Diversion and alternative programs account for a good part of this decline. Since occupational and educational components characterize these programs, and because these efforts reflect the goals of the National Advisory Commission reports, a survey of such program trends is presented below.

Occupational Programs: Although most of the literature refers to employment skills training as "vocational" training, the term "occupational" is used in this paper to describe these programs. This terminology is intended to distinguish programs designed to provide students with the skills required to function successfully in a full-time employment position (occupation) from those single dimensional courses offered as stimulants to avocational activities. Vocational skills courses are traditionally taught in secondary schools. Occupational programs are most often offered in postsecondary educational institutions and business training schools.

Occupational training has been an aim of many correctional institutions since the early part of the 20th century and particularly after 1930, when the Federal act providing for occupational training and education for inmates was passed. The Federal Prison Industries, Inc. was established in 1934 as a way of providing such training. Criticism of both traditional prison occupational programs and the Federal Prison Industries has been severe. Complaints focus on the exploitation of inmates, the use of outdated equipment, and the limited opportunities for inmates to learn marketable skills. In general, it has been concluded that occupational training programs rarely succeeded in rehabilitating offenders.[54]

Interest in improving occupational training for inmates is growing, and there are at present a variety of programs.[55] Typical training for men includes auto mechanics, machine shop skills, accounting, and data processing as well as training in trades such as welding and carpentry. Programs teaching many of these skills, for example, are offered at geographically dispersed institutions such as the Illinois State Penitentiary in Pontiac, Lorton in Virginia, and Washington State Corrections Center. Some programs reveal, however, unusual occupational choices. Project New View in Pennsylvania, for instance, offers courses in Landscaping Design and Ornamental Nursery skills. The Massachusetts Correctional Institute at Norfolk offers courses in Technical Theatre and Training, and the California Institution for Men at Chino offers Animal Grooming and Deep Sea Diving. As these programs suggest, there is a relatively wide range of courses available to male inmates. The literature indicates that many of these offerings are developed on the basis of present and projected job opportunities.

For the most part, occupational training for women seems to be largely in those traditional skills which have been classified as appropriate for women. At the Minnesota Correctional Institution for Women in Shakopee, inmates are trained as assemblers, psychiatric technicians, food technicians, clerical workers, laboratory technicians, and counsellors. Most of the job skills taught to inmates at the Purdy Treatment Center for Women reveal the same tendency: first-year participants, for example, are trained in secretarial skills, cosmetology, barbering, nursing, teaching, grocery checking, and child care; less traditional training is offered in three fields: data processing, commercial art, and electronics. Since it is often difficult to learn the number of women involved in various job training programs, it is worth noting the data from Purdy. Of the women employed from July 1, 1971 through December 31, 1973, ten were clerk-typists, eight cooks, six secretaries, five housekeepers, five nurse's aides, and five cosmetologists; of the entire group, only five were employed as power machine operators, three as data processors, two as accountants, and one as a tailor. Seventeen of the thirty-one women in work-trainee positions were clerk-typists. Of the sixty-five pursuing additional training, twenty-five were in college (major fields not given), but of the remaining forty, ten were pursuing secretarial studies, five cosmetology, six nursing and four child care.[56] The California Institute for Women in Frontera offers programs in practical nursing and cosmetology.[57] In the Rehabilitation Program for Dallas County Jail inmates, women were offered secretarial science and typing, which were not open to men.[58] It is likely that training for women offenders is bound to undergo a marked change in the future, for the 1972 L.E.A.A. restrictions on sex discrimination and the June 1972 passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments, which bans sex discrimination in educational programs and activities receiving Federal funds, is bound to affect the varieties of courses available to women.

Occupational Program Sources. Programs and staff for occupational training derive from three sources. Some are wholly designed and taught by the correctional staff. Others, however, make use of community resources, calling upon businesses, industries and trade unions to help design programs and staff them. Honeywell Computer Systems, IBM, Philco-Ford, General Motors, EXXON, Volkswagen, and Xerox all offer training programs. The AFL-CIO is involved in a Baltimore Model Cities Program where men are taught shipyard welding skills, diesel preventive maintenance mechanics, pipefitting, and carpentry. Pre-apprentice training programs are offered in auto mechanics, auto body repair, dry cleaning, and food service at the Youth Reception and Correction Center in Yardville, New Jersey, and a fully accredited Apprentice Machine Shop Program is offered at San Quentin.

An even larger number of programs, however, are developed in cooperation with educational institutions, especially two-year colleges. To cite just five examples: Joliet Junior College runs an A.A. degree program in culinary arts, auto mechanics, machine shop, accounting/data processing, and drafting at the Illinois State Penitentiary in Pontiac.

Kirkwood Community College in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, holds courses in five vocational fields at the Men's Reformatory; Jackson Community College offers courses to inmates of the State Prison of Southern Michigan; Okaloosa-Walton Junior College offers approximately ten vocational courses for the Federal Prison Camp at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida; and Olympic Community College runs a program with the Washington Corrections Center in Shelton.

Occupational Program Locations. Most occupational training programs take place in the prisons, but a few provide at least some training in the community. For example, training as an auto mechanic under the General Motors program takes place at a GM training center. In the EXXON Service Station Attendant and Mechanic Course about 25 percent of graduated students participate in a work-release program. Trainees in the Xerox program who have not yet been placed on parole may be assigned to work-release and reside in a work-release center. In a Night Owl Program, inmates enrolled in the Jackson Community College attend classes on campus at night, from 9:30 p.m. to 3:00 a.m. Inmates from the Federal Prison Camp at Eglin Air Force Base attend classes with civilians at the Okaloosa-Walton Junior College.

It seems probable that more and more inmate occupational training programs will take advantage of community resources, since businesses, trade unions, and educational institutions already have the resources and capabilities to teach offenders marketable skills. It seems equally probable that more of these programs will actually be located in the community, where adequate facilities and equipment are already easily obtainable.

Education Programs. The greatest change in education in penal institutions has been the expansion of postsecondary education within the last six years. In 1968, two survey reports, one by Stuart Adams and one by Roger Morris, "indicated that between a fourth and a third of the state prison systems offered college courses "live" within the walls of prison."[59] Only three years later, however, in a 1971 dissertation on college-level educational programs, C. Alton Laird wrote that "Educational opportunities for inmates of correctional institutions to participate in college-level programs are increasing rapidly."[60] In the same year, a survey of junior colleges, conducted by John J. Connolly and Stuart Adams, found that 121 institutions were "collaborating with prisons to provide college-level instruction to inmates." Adams estimated that at that time "about 150 colleges or universities" were involved in inmate education.[61] The National Survey of Postsecondary Educational Programs conducted by the NewGate Resource Center in 1973 found that of 305 penal institutions contacted, 218 (71%) offerred postsecondary courses.[62] In charting the introduction of these courses, the Center noted that the number of new programs doubled in 1968 and 1969, and there was "fairly consistant but less dramatic growth" from 1970 to the present.[63]

The growth of postsecondary courses may be the result of one or more of the following factors. It may have been influenced by the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration

of Justice, which argued that:

> Universities have an indispendable role to play in filling the knowledge gap that exists throughout corrections. However, two hazards should be avoided: Heavily vocational programs which purport to answer questions about how to perform correctional functions without addressing the complexities of what and why and thus further isolate corrections from the university community; and conversely the reluctance of scholars to address the specific problems faced by those charged with the perplexing task of controlling and rehabilitating offenders.[64]

The increasing educational level of offenders has stressed the need to introduce more postsecondary courses. According to John J. Marsh, "An estimated 40,000 inmates were ready for college-level work in 1965. Researchers assume that this figure is greater today because of the improved level of education in the nation as a whole and the growing number of inmates. An additional increase may be expected because of recent efforts to educate minorities."[65] Finally, the success of projects like that at San Quentin and the Oregon NewGate Program probably helped to alter traditional attitudes about education in penal institutions while providing incentives and models to follow.

It is worth noting that community colleges have become deeply involved in postsecondary programs as well as remedial programs for incarcerated offenders. The appropriateness of this involvement is summarized by Stuart Adams and John J. Connolly in "The Role of Junior Colleges in the Prison Community":

> Many characteristics of community and junior colleges make them especially suited to conduct educational programs for prisoners, probationers, and parolees. Most public institutions are "open door" so admissions problems are few. Their offerings range broadly, from the purely vocational to the primarily intellectual and esthetic. The occupational curriculums are varied and can accommodate a wide array of student needs, interests, and abilities. The colleges are relatively experienced in meeting the special requirements of disadvantaged persons. They are ubiquitous, and, therefore, readily accessible to most of the nation's correctional facilities. Finally, community services and adult education are both major functions of the community college, and a cooperative prison educational program falls into either of these categories.[66]

For these reasons it seems likely that the community college will continue to assume a major responsibility in on-going and future educational programs for offenders.

Education Programs: The expansion of postsecondary offerings is part of a general trend to provide higher education opportunities to inmates, a trend which has brought about innovations and experimentation. For example, the Texas Department of Corrections was designated by the State Legislature as a public school system "whereby the department is eligible for daily attendance funds for a comprehensive program from grades 1 through 12."[67] A number of other states have followed this model.

The experimentation with teaching methods and materials, which developed in the 1960's in the public schools, has influenced correctional programs. For instance, four state prisons in New Jersey have courses taught by Mercer County Community College through the use of a video system which permits two-day communication. The use of programmed materials was developed at Draper, and a non-graded approach was used at the Hagerstown, Maryland, Correctional Training Center. In 1970, Auburn State Prison, in cooperation with Auburn College, compared three innovative teaching techniques: the use of the electrowriter and speaker phone, the use of television and speakerphone, and study release. In 1971, the Board of Education for New York City opened a new public school within the Women's House of Detention on Riker's Island to develop a model total education program for youthful offenders. Working in cooperation with Columbia University Teacher's College, the Board of Education developed a teacher training program and in 1972 opened a post-release community center in Harlem.

The concern for the improvement of offenders' education has led to the increasing involvement of college faculty and facilities. The National Survey of Postsecondary Education Programs indicates that colleges and universities now have the major teaching responsibility for educational courses offered in penal institutions.[68] Usually, faculty comes from the community into the prison, where, in general, remedial, secondary, and postsecondary level courses are taught. But there appears to be a growing tendency to send inmates on study furlough or release to attend classes at a college. For instance, after completing the first stage of in-prison classes, inmates at the Fricot Ranch School for Boys in California were enrolled as full-time students at Columbia Junior College.[69] The Lorton Project in Washington, D.C. busses to the Federal City College campus inmates who have completed the freshman program.[70] And after completing courses offered in prison, inmates at the Southampton (Virginia) Correctional Farm are permitted to enroll in classes at Paul D. Camp Community College.[71]

At present the actual number of inmates who attend classes on campus is small. Mr. Ted Wallman, Superintendent of the Women's Reformatory in Rockwell City, Iowa, for example, reports that at this time four inmates are enrolled at a community college.[72] Only about ten inmates from Southampton Correctional Farm were placed on education release so that they could attend Paul D. Camp Community College on a full-time basis. According to the "Inventory of Higher Education Programs" during the academic year 1972-73, only seven inmates were on study release at the

University of Colorado, Denver, only fifteen attended South Florida Junior College, and only five attended the Hutchinson (Kansas) Community Junior College.[73]

The involvement of educational institutions in the development of offender education is a concept which is just beginning to take firm hold. Moving out into the community from the penal institution, rather than bringing the community into the institution, is a recent phenomenon. Successful programs which enroll inmates in on-campus programs or which permit them to be released earlier in order to further their education will encourage penal institutions to enlarge their educational activities in the community. No penal institution can match the scope, the faculty, and the facilities which educational institutions provide. Mr. Ted Wallman pointed out the major advantage of sending inmates into the community when he wrote about the experience of the Iowa Reformatory for Women: "We have found it relatively impractical to conduct a variety of college-type programs here. Our solution to this problem has been to send our clients into nearby communities which have programs deemed appropriate to the client."[74]

Thus far no experimental program exists in which convicted offenders return to the community for vocational and/or educational rehabilitation at an educational institution in lieu of incarceration. The project which resembles most closely such a program is the Fort Des Moines Community Centered Project in Iowa. "Although it is sometimes used for offenders on the way out of prison, it is most often used for offenders as an alternative to prison. Its programs encompass those generally described as work or education release."[75] The project employs a problem-solving approach to determine the offender's "educational, vocational, and psychiatric needs." Once a treatment plan is worked out, a contract is developed. "All inmates work on regular jobs in the community and attend full-time remedial education or vocational training programs offered by existing community resources."[76] Participants work and study in Des Moines. They are housed together in a "two story army barracks located on a military reservation."[77] While "there are no bars or fences, the facility is staffed sufficiently well to allow a great deal of personal observation and control."[78]

Summary: While it is clear that a good deal of innovation and experimentation in this field is currently being conducted, the uncertain results of these programs coupled with the strong national drive for community alternatives to the present justice system suggests that even more is necessary. New models need to be created and applied which attempt to bring to bear on the problem of crime and delinquency all the relevant resources in the community. Special emphasis in these programs should be given to assisting offenders become self-sufficient, self-reliant contributors to the community good. (The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges' project, Offender Assistance Through Community Colleges, offers one such model.) A carefully structured and applied evaluation design should be an integral part of every new effort, so that results can be stated confidently. (The extensive NewGate

evaluation provides one such model.) Community residents, all of whom have a vested interest in the conduct of these programs, should share decision making responsibilities. (The Baltimore Pre-Trial Intervention Project is a good example.) The economics of these programs should be carefully analyzed as a means of establishing the benefits or liabilities of them. (For this work, the American Bar Association, Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, Office of Economics of Corrections, would be a helpful resource.) Furthermore, the successes and failures of past and present programs should form the foundation upon which new programs are generated. (A number of national clearinghouse for such information are currently operating. The largest service of this kind is the LEAA Reference Service.)

To assist interested individuals and groups to establish these kinds of community correctional programs the following section is offered. This series of guidelines is not meant to be comprehensive, but rather it suggests some significant areas which should be addressed in creating new programs.

V.

Planning A Program

In constructing an experimental educational program, several areas of concern should be addressed. The review of the literature suggests that the following issues are most significant.

I. Selection

No program should be designed in isolation, that is, without a clear idea of whom it will serve. Otherwise, there is the danger that the program will become the right program for the wrong people.

Perhaps a more serious danger - at least for a program which is meant to be a model - is the selection of "safe" participants, those who are likely to succeed without special opportunities. While "safe" participants make a program appear "successful", they do not really test or refine the model.

Careful selection requires both sensitivity and courage: the sensitivity to choose, on the basis of relatively limited knowledge, those for whom the program genuinely serves a need, and the courage to choose students who are "risks," who might indeed fail. One great asset of the original Upward Bound NewGate Project was its commitment to taking chances, to selecting participants who were not "safe".

A further problem centers upon the question of who does the selecting. For the most part, selection in pretrial diversion and prison occupational and/or educational programs is made by court or correctional personnel.

If a program is to be placed in the community and is developed in cooperation with educational institutions, it is appropriate for a consortium composed of correctional, educational, and community representatives to be involved in the selection process. In this way, more than one point of view is brought to bear, and the differing perspectives should serve to balance each other.

Before selection begins, it is necessary for the program designers to have worked out in detail the criteria for selection. This means deciding numerous details such as:

(a) the minimum length of sentence offenders must be serving in order to be able to complete the program.

(b) the minimum and maximum age limitations.

(c) the limitation on records and offenses. As was discussed earlier, a number of programs exclude offenders of violent crimes or those with extensive previous records. The question which such exclusion raises for selection is: How wide a range of representative types should be included? It may be preferable to limit a program to one group (say, for example, first offenders or those convicted of misdemeanors).

(d) the educational requirements. In a program dealing with rehabilitation through training and/or education, the background required of the student must be worked out carefully. Otherwise, involvement in the program may become for some students another source of frustration and failure. For example, in a postsecondary program, selectors must decide the minimum requirements: a high school diploma, an equivalency degree, a set performance on standardized tests (and which tests and who administers them), or a trial period in which seemingly unqualified students have a chance to perform. Since language skills and reading level are often barriers to learning, it is particularly important to establish the minimum language and reading levels necessary for students to survive.

For a program to serve effectively as a model, it must be designed for a representative cross-section of offenders. If not, the program serves only a specialized group. It is necessary, therefore, that the selection of participants achieve an equitable racial, sexual, social, and economic balance.

Furthermore, the assumptions underlying these selection criteria should be enumerated and examined. Such an effort should serve to objectify selection procedures and simplify evaluation.

II. Program Design

One of the most important questions to be asked about program design is: Who does it? The problem of bringing to bear as informed a group as possible arises. A community-based educational project for offenders suggests that at least three specialists are needed: one in corrections, one in education, and one in community affairs. But even these three may be too limited. An educational management specialist, for example, may know a great deal about developing programs but very little about the psychological stresses participants may meet. The program designers should include a variety of specialists, or if this is impossible, they should consult with them before and during the development of the program.

A great deal of discussion in recent years has been concerned with how deeply students should be involved in designing educational programs. The basic argument is that students - precisely because they are students - bring a perspective to educational design which by differing from that of professional educators enriches the program. For innovative offender programs the need for such enrichment seems even greater since designers of these programs have rarely experienced the criminal justice process as offenders have done. In order to assure a meaningful program for offenders, therefore, it is wise to involve offenders in the planning.

Equally important is the philosopy upon which a program is based. Numerous questions come to mind. For example: What is the program meant to accomplish? In what ways should and can this be done? Should enrollment in the program be voluntary? How much choice should participants have in the selection of courses and teachers? How should tensions between staff members, students, and staff and students be handled? To what extent should work and programs be individualized? What should be the proper balance between academic and occupational training? What standards (educational and social) should be imposed? How much supportive help (such as counselling or therapy) should participants receive?

It is imperative that a philosophy be developed before the details of a program are worked out. Otherwise, there is the danger that the program will become diffuse or that individual solutions will be arbitrary. Since one criticism of many programs in penal institutions is inequitable treatment[79], a program for offenders is under an obligation to assure that students are treated equitably.

The selection of offenders for participation in an experimental program involves a commitment on the part of the program to these offenders. To fulfill this commitment, the design of a program must go beyond its termination. What the NewGate National Survey points out about programs for incarcerated students is equally true for programs which are community based: "It is no service to an institution resident to provide him with the opportunity to increase his aspiration level while he is locked up and then not provide supportive services to him after he is released."[80]

A follow-through needs to be developed as part of a total program design. A project like that now operated by the State of Wisconsin Higher Education Aids Board - which offers ex-offenders educational counselling and financial aid - provides a possible model for other types of programs. However the follow-through is handled, if a program is to assist in the reintegration process, not frustrate, it must make certain that its program design insures that participants are not forgotten when the program ends.

The extent to which participants should be involved in the community in general is of paramount importance. Halfway houses have found that offenders receive support from living together as a transition from the prison to the free world. The Fort Des Moines project follows this practice by housing participants in one location. But it may be preferable to include a variety of living situations, that is, for some offenders to live alone, others to live together, and still others to live with their families. A question which arises in deciding living arrangements for participants in a community-centered program is: How much responsibility should the offender have in choosing his or her living arrangements? An issue which is implied in this discussion, and which needs to be considered in the following discussions as well, is the extent to which parole and probation requirements should act as models for offender actions and behavior.

Since women offenders often have dependent children, the issue of whether or not a woman should be permitted to have them with her needs to be considered. In addition, if the children are to be with the mother, arrangements must be made to provide child care so that she can fulfill her responsibilities. It is unrealistic to expect a woman who is worried about her children to be able to work and function at her best.

Other problems related to the community must also be decided. For example, during their free time, what restrictions should be placed upon the activities of offenders? How free are they within the community at large, rather than within the educational institution?

III. Community Support

In order to succeed a community-based program needs community support. This support should be drawn from three sources: the institution which houses the program, the community-at-large (that is, from the city or county in which the program is located), and from the local criminal justice system.

Mr. Eddie Harrison, Director of the Baltimore Pre-Trial Intervention Project, has found that the best way to insure community support is to involve the community in each step of a program, thus diminishing the chances of community resistence.[81] He suggests including as many community people as possible in a program so that it comes to be thought of as "ours", rather than "yours" or "theirs."

In addition, program administrators should contact and involve active local groups, particularly those which represent varying services and social levels, so that the program becomes identified with the community as a whole rather than with one particular segment. For example, groups representing business organizations, labor unions, community service clubs, youth service bureaus, city government agencies like the Department of Human Resources and Housing, tenant associations, and religious organizations should all be approached.

When contacting community groups, the following activities are suggested:

1. Handle contacts in person (perhaps through a program community resource representative) rather than in writing.

2. Meet with the groups or a committee composed of its officers to explain the goals and operation of the program.

3. Include in this explanation the ways the program will serve the community.

4. Know precisely what services each group can offer and ask for help. For instance, community groups might offer support in revising regulations or speeding up procedures at agencies which affect the program, provide volunteers to work in the program, or make available supplies, equipment, or facilities which can improve the program.

5. When discussing the program with city agencies, attempt to obtain a firm commitment of resources which will be allotted to the program so that it is not competing later with other programs for limited funds or services.

Since an effective community-based program for offenders requires the cooperation of the local criminal justice system, representatives from the courts and correctional agencies should become involved in planning the program so that they are utilized from the beginning. It is essential that a program have credibility in the eyes of the court and correctional officers as a viable and necessary addition to corrections. Since the criminal justice system is already overloaded, the program should serve to reduce - not increase - the work of local agencies. This means that it should assume responsibility for collecting and forwarding whatever data is needed by correctional officers and for keeping the local courts and criminal justice agencies informed about the progress of the program and its participants.

In general, it is helpful to assign one person in the program to act as the community representative so that responsibility for community relations has a focus and those contacting the program know whom to approach. Furthermore, it is equally helpful - whether dealing with

local groups, city agencies, the courts, or correctional agencies - to have one person in each unit designated as the program contact. This can simplify administrative procedures, solidify the relationship between the program and a group through consistent personal contact, and, thus, develop an informed source of support for the program within each group.

IV. Publicity

Program involvement of the community and the local criminal justice system means that the program will inevitably receive some publicity. How widely publicized a program should be, however, is a matter of serious concern since bad publicity can hurt participants and jeopardize the program. For example, the controversy in Pennsylvania in 1973 over the enrollment of a woman offender from Muncy at Williamsport Community College harmed both the offender and the prison's educational release program. The woman was taken out of college for a time, then later readmitted. The publicity discouraged her, she performed less well than she had previously, and never completed the work for her degree. After she was parolled, she left the state. In addition, the number of women offenders from Muncy who could attend college declined because the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation withdrew its financial support and, therefore, only those who could afford tuition could enroll.[82]

Limited publicity may, perhaps, help a program survive problems raised by individual participants who become involved in criminal activities. If little is known about a program, the negative publicity may center upon the individuals rather than upon their involvement in a program.

In general, however, avoiding publicity seems an inappropriate response to the problem. When discussing the controversy at Muncy, for instance, Margery L. Velimesis, Director of the Pennsylvania Program for Women and Girl Offenders, Inc., suggested that the educational release program had probably received too little publicity. She recommended that as early as the planning stage the staff of a program begin to inform community groups about the goals of the program, the service it provides the community, and the contributions it will make to the criminal justice system. In this way, the program will be able to gain enough support from the community at large and the local criminal justice system to counteract any adverse publicity which it might later receive.

Eddie Harrison suggests that a program be well publicized so that it is kept in the "public conscience and eye." Such publicity helps solidify resources and reminds the community that the program belongs to them.

In general, it is best for program staff to avoid confrontations over adverse publicity unless they are absolutely necessary. Confrontations rarely help a program, and it is preferable to let adverse publicity

die as quickly and quietly as it can. A good program which has genuine community and criminal justice support will survive the occasional bad publicity it receives.

V. Financing

The full implementation of a program depends upon adequate funding to assure that its objectives can be fulfilled. Yet obtaining adequate funding is, as John McCartt and Thomas Mangogna pointed out in Guidelines and Standards for Halfway Houses and Community Treatment Centers," ...often a complex and frustrating experience. Whether the agency is private and nonprofit, or Federal or state, insufficient money is a perpetual problem."[83]

In general, it is unlikely that a program will receive complete funding from only one source. It is much more likely that funding will come from several different sources. Program directors, therefore, must begin as early as possible to apply for grants from various agencies and groups. To do so, directors:

1. should organize the budget so that its various sections can be funded separately (for example, housing, administrative costs, participant vocational or educational activities, counselling, supportive services, and transportation);

2. should know which Federal, state, county, and city agencies are possible sources of funding, and what provisions make the program eligible for grants or contracts;

3. should investigate national and local foundations, as well as service, community and religious groups to discover which are possible sources of funding;

4. should know well in advance the deadlines for the intended grant applications. Federal grants (often with matching state grants) are potentially the best funding source.

Messrs. McCartt and Mangogna suggested that:

> In addition to being thoroughly familiar with the financial guides or manuals published by any given funding agency for a particular grant or contract, the grantee agency, public or private, should also be thoroughly familiar with Bureau of the Budget Circular A-87, Attachments A and B, if the funding agency is a Federal one. This circular addresses itself to many aspects of grant administration, not the least of which is the subject of allowable and unallowable costs. Although some Federal funding agencies may fund some programs and even items that others may not, Circular A-87 is the general document setting down basic principles applicable to all Federal funding agencies. All Federal funding agencies are required to follow the guidelines and principles promulgated in Circular A-87.

> Every Federal funding agency should have available copies of the Circular, and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, prints it in its "Financial Guide for Administration of Planning and Action Grants."[84]

They recommended the following publications as helpful in determining indirect costs where funding derives from several Federal agencies simultaneously:

1. GAM "Grants Administration" - Departmental Staff Manual
2. OASC-1 "A Guide for Educational Institutions" - Establishing Indirect Cost Rates for Research Grants and Contracts with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
3. OASC-3 "A Guide for Hospitals"
4. OASC-5 "A Guide for Non-profit Institutions"
5. OASC-6 "A Guide for State Government Agencies"
6. OASC-7 "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Procedures for Establishing Indirect Cost Rates Under BOB Circular A-87"

In addition, the following L.E.A.A., publication might be helpful: "Financial Guide for Administration of Planning and Action Grants," Title I, Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. All of these are available from the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.[85]

Federal agencies which are possible sources for funding are:[86]

1. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Department of Justice - for correctional programs. Funds are administered through state planning agencies.
2. Bureau of Prisons - for correctional programs.
3. Model Cities - particularly for housing, but for other areas as well.
4. Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation - for a variety of areas such as housing, transportation, tuition, and some medical expenses.
5. Office of Economic Opportunity - for anti-poverty programs.
6. National Institute of Mental Health - for areas dealing with mental health, drug abuse, and drug addiction.

7. Department of Labor - for vocational training programs. In particular, funds may be available through the Manpower Administration.

8. Office of Education - in particular, funds may be available through offices dealing with higher education, special education, bi-cultural education, minority education, innovative programs, and Teacher Corps. Note, however, that funding may be limited to programs for youths under 18 or 25 and/or to programs in secondary education.

9. Veterans Administration - for participants who are eligible as former G.I.'s or their children.

10. Social Security Administration - Under Title IV-A "...provisions exist for funding of community-based treatment programs for those clients who 'in the past, presently, or who appear as candidates for the future' to be welfare recipients."87

11. Action - for VISTA volunteers.

12. Department of Transportation - for transportation-related funds.

13. National Institute of Corrections - for training and research.

State, county, and city agencies are also possible sources of funding. State and local agencies whose functions parallel those of the Federal agencies listed above should be contacted. In particular, directors should approach the departments of Corrections, Human Resources, Education and the Office of Economic Security to discover what funds may be available for vocational and educational programs. It may be useful to contact the City Council for funds or for help with possible funding sources.

Non-government sources for funding depend upon the groups in a particular area. The United Appeal and the Community Chest fund programs dealing with social problems. The local chapter of the National Alliance of Businessmen, local service groups like Kiwanis, the Rotary Club, the Lions Club, the Masons, and Chamber of Commerce may have some funds available as may service arms of religious organizations.

The degree to which foundations are willing and able to provide funding depends upon the concerns of the particular foundation and the amount of money which is available. Since the financial well-being of a foundation is dependent upon the well-being of the economy, the availability of funds varies. Some programs, however, have received substantial help from foundations. As of 1973, for example, Offender Aid and Restoration of Virginia, Inc. received one-third of its costs from private groups, including the following foundations: Norman Foundation of New

York, New York Foundation, Burlington Mills Foundation, Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, 1907 Foundation, Foundation for Volunteer Services, Meyer Foundation of Washington, D.C. and Public Welfare Foundation.[88]

A directory listing and describing foundations is available from The Foundation Center, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 or 888 Seventh Avenue, New York 10019. The cost is $17.00. The Center also publishes a quarterly which provides the most recent information on foundations. Subscriptions can be obtained from: Columbia University Press, 136 South Broadway, Irvington-on-the-Hudson, New York 10533. The present rate is $7.50 a year. In addition, the Center has regional collections of information on foundations in fifty libraries throughout the United States, and directors might find it useful to inquire of the Center the location of the nearest regional collection.

Program costs can be lowered by the appropriate use of volunteers. During recent years, volunteers have become increasingly involved in criminal justice programs. Volunteers for Probation - to cite but one example - began in Royal Oak, Michigan, with only eight volunteers and is now a national organization.[89] A growing number of VISTA volunteers are serving in court-related or probation and parole programs. If volunteers can serve a purpose, they should be recruited, either from Action, the community at large, and/or the institutions in which a program is located.

Costs can be further reduced if some services, supplies, equipment, and facilities are donated or loaned to the program. Businesses, labor unions, service and social action groups, and religious organizations are possible sources.

Both the use of volunteers, especially those drawn from the community and the institutions in which a program is based, and the use of donated services and items by community groups have a great advantage. By giving concrete help to a program, the community shares responsibility for its success and, as a result, strengthens its support. Program directors, therefore, should not only look for sources of multiple funding but also for ways to deepen the involvement of the community by making use of its resources.

VI. Evaluation

Many correctional programs have been criticized - and justly so - because the evaluation component has been inadequate. Any program, but especially one which is innovative, should develop an effective method of assessing its weaknesses and strengths. Otherwise, its value as a model for future programs will be limited.[90]

However, as Sara M. Steele pointed out in Contemporary Approaches to Program Evaluation:

Ideas about evaluation are changing. Beliefs about program evaluation plateaued for a few years during the 1950s and 1960s when evaluation was equated with research methodology to such an extent that sometimes the terms measurement and evaluation were treated interchangeably. During that period, too, evaluation was often limited to determining whether content-specific objectives had been achieved.

Then the late 1960s brought an influx of new programs and new demands for evaluation. Established concepts didn't deliver. As a result, new ideas about evaluation emerged and new frameworks appeared. There's considerable divergence in those ideas. Most of them are still in the trial-and-testing stage. Many paths are being taken off the plateau of the earlier period, but few of those paths are widely accepted. None can be considered the main route. Some explore evaluation from the standpoint of its purpose, some from the standpoint of need, some from the view of organization and system, and some from the interactive elements involved. New definitions of evaluation are evolving.[91]

Two definitions which may be helpful in developing an evaluation component are:[92]

> Evaluation is the systematic process of judging the worth, desirability, effectiveness, or adequacy of something according to definite criteria and purposes. The judgment is based upon a careful comparison of observation data with criteria standards. Precise definitions of what is to be appraised, clearly stated purposes, specific standards for the criteria traits, accurate observations and measurements, and logical conclusions are the hallmarks of valid evaluation.
>
> Harris, Wilbur. "The Nature and Functions of Educational Evaluations," Peabody Journal of Education, XLVI (September, 1968), 95.

> Social program evaluation is the systematic accumulation of facts for providing information about the achievement of program requisites and goals relative to efforts, effectiveness, and efficiency within any stage of program development. The factors of evaluation may be obtained through a variety of relatively systematic techniques, and they are incorporated into some designated system of values for making decisions about social program.
>
> Tripodi, Tony, Phillip Fellin, and Irwin Epstein. Social Program Evaluation. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971, p. 12.

Such definitions "...recognize that one specific procedural definition doesn't meet the range of needs or fully use the powerful potential of evaluation."[93] In general, evaluation is now seen as a process, not a procedure, a process "...of forming judgments about programs using criteria or standards of comparison and descriptions of what occurred and resulted in the program" and "...of using information in comparing alternatives in reaching program decisions."[94]

The ways in which evaluation is used depend, of course, upon the purposes it is meant to serve. For example, is it meant: To assess the on-going progress of a program? To assess a program's strengths and weaknesses? To compare the program with others?

The functions of evaluation should be decided early so that the development of appropriate processes is part of the program design. Otherwise, the effectiveness of the evaluation may be undermined. The goals of a program, for instance, have to be developed so that they are measurable. The steps by which these goals are to be achieved need to be developed precisely so that the program's success in achieving each of them can be assessed.

Terms need to be defined clearly. To cite one example: A common goal of many correctional programs is "to reduce recidivism." But what does the term actually refer to? To the number of participants rearrested? On what charges? Under what conditions - probation violations or new crimes? Does it refer only to the number of new conditions which participants receive? Or to the number of those placed in prison? Moreover, how does the program plan to reduce recidivism? How are these plans weighed in evaluating the program's success in achieving this goal?

As was discussed earlier, the method of selecting participants is crucial in the development of a program. For evaluation purposes, the best method is random selection, since this is the most objective. If random selection is rejected as too difficult to obtain or unsuitable, care should be taken to provide a balanced participant group so that the validity of the program evaluation is not diminished because of the method of selection.

The use of control groups will strengthen a program's evaluation. For programs dealing with offenders, the most obvious control group is one made up of offenders with similar backgrounds who have been selected in the same way as the program participants. In addition, it would be useful to have a control group composed of non-offenders who have goals similar to those established for the program participants. The offender control group provides a way of measuring the effect of the program upon an offender population; the non-offender control group serves as a way of evaluating the effectiveness of the program in bringing about changes in participant aims, attitudes, and behaviors.

Tools for evaluation must be selected with great care. In particular, the use of standardized tests requires serious attention. Since

an offender group is usually drawn from a disadvantaged population, the appropriateness of these tests may be questionable, depending as it often does upon the group on which they were standardized, and the racial, cultural, and sexual biases they reflect. Selecting appropriate standardized tests requires a thorough knowledge of the tests available and an awareness of the needs of the program.

Specialized questionnaires and forms which assess the progress of the participants will probably have to be developed since it is unlikely that whatever standardized tests are used will be sufficient. These can serve a wide range of functions, including obtaining relevant background about the participants, on-going assessments of the program by staff and participants, and indications of significant changes in participant aims, attitudes and behaviors.

When and how often a measurement tool is used will vary. Standardized tests, for example, might be used at the beginning of a program as a basis for participant counselling and at the end as a means of determining the degree of change. Questionnaires might be given participants weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly. Staff reports might be prepared quarterly. Ideally, the scheduling of tests, questionnaires and forms should provide a reliable final evaluation and an accurate on-going record of the progress of the program and its participants.

In developing the evaluation component of a program, designers should keep in mind that the value of a program cannot be judged at its end. A follow-up is necessary in order to determine the long-term effect the program has had upon its participants. The length of the follow-up and its complexity should be part of the program design.

In addition, designers of the evaluation component should consider how their evaluation processes can be useful to others. Data from the program might be collected in such a way that it could be used in future studies dealing with offenders' backgrounds, problems, behaviors, and needs. Finally, designers should remember that any evaluation process must be adequately funded. Attempting too much with too little funding can only coarsen the quality of the evaluation. It is far wiser to limit the scope of an evaluation to those factors which can be handled fully with the staff, resources, and monies available.

Conclusion: The discussion above presents a general overview of issues which should be considered in any program development activity. Specific activities are necessarily dictated by the particular objectives and organization of a program. One of the first steps any new project should undertake is a thorough literature search of completed and operating programs which are significantly like the one contemplated. By building on the successes of these projects while avoiding their mistakes, new programs can produce greater achievements in shorter periods of time. And, to add to the advancement of knowledge and success in these endeavors, it should be the responsibility of program managers to record the history of their efforts so that others can learn from them.

A final word. As was noted in the credit section at the beginning of this paper, the Offender Assistance office at the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges has on file many of the materials listed in the several appendices. Those on file are so indicated. Upon request, this office will mail copies of these materials.

NOTES

1. William G. Nagel, The New Red Barn: A Critical Look at the Modern American Prison. New York: Walker and Company (published for the American Foundation, Inc.) 1973, p. 12.

2. Ibid.

3. Kathryn Watterson Burkhart, Women in Prison. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1973, p. 214.

4. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Corrections. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973, p. 1.

5. Nagel, p. 13.

6. Norval Morris and Gordon Hawkins, the honest politician's guide to crime control. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1970, p. 117. The spread is explained by the fact that, "The kind of rigorous studies necessary to determine the extent to which prisoners in the U.S. return to prison have not been done." (ibid.) Estimates have run as high as 80 percent. In A Natiopal Strategy to Reduce Crime, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals states that from 65 percent to 77% of those arrested in 1971 for Federal crimes of violence and burglary had been arrested at least once before (p. 14).

7. American Friends Service Committee, Struggle for Justice - A Report on Crime and Punishment in America. New York: Hill & Wang, 1971, p. 26.

8. Burkhart, p. 299.

9. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967, p. 171.

10. Ibid.

11. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, A National Strategy to Reduce Crime. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973, p. 12.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid.

14. Comptroller General of the U.S., "Report to the Congress - Rehabilitating Inmates of Federal Prisons: Special Programs Help, But Not Enough." Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973,

15. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Community Crime Prevention. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973, p. 113.

16. A National Strategy, p. 14.

17. Ibid.

18. Virginia A. McArthur, From Convict to Citizen: Programs for the Woman Offender. Washington, D. C.: D. C. Commission on the Status of Women, June, 1974, pp. 4 and 8.

19. Ibid., p. 8.

20. Ibid, pp. 4-5.

21. A National Strategy, p. 14.

22. Ibid., p. 117.

23. Corrections, p. 365.

24. Webster's Third International Dictionary - Unabridged. Springfield, Massachusetts: G. and C. Merriam Company, 1971, p. 63.

25. Raymond T. Nimmer, Diversion - The Search for Alternative Forms of Prosecution, Chicago: The American Bar Foundation, 1974, p. 4.

26. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Police. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973, p. 80.

27. Community Crime Prevention, p. 59.

28. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Courts. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973, p. 27.

29, Corrections, p. 73.

30. Nimmer, p. 5.

31. Ibid., pp. 4-5.

32. Corrections, p. 159.

33. Ibid., p. 312.

34. American Bar Association Project on Standards for Criminal Justice, Standards Relating to Probation, New York: American Bar Association, "Approved Draft 1970", p. 9.

35. Ibid., p. 23.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid., pp. 23-24.

38. Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Hearing Before the Subcommittee on S. 798 (The Community Supervision and Services Act), March 27, 1973, p.2.

39. Ibid.

40. A National Strategy, p. 93.

41. Courts, p.1.

42. National Pretrial Intervention Service Center, American Bar Association, Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, Portfolio of Descriptive Profiles on Selected Pretrial Criminal Justice Intervention Programs. Washington, D. C., April 1974, "Foreward".

43. National Pretrial Intervention Service Center, American Bar Association, Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, Source Book in Pretrial Criminal Justice Intervention Techniques and Action Programs. Washington, D. C., May 1974, p. 2.

44. This information was given during a telephone conversation in September, 1974, with Ms. Doris Meissner, Assistant U. S. Attorney General.

45. J. A. Robertson, "Pre-Trial Diversion of Drug Offenders - A Statutory Approach," Boston University Law Review, Vol. 52, No. 2 (Spring, 1972), pp. 335-71.

46. This information was given during an interview with Mr. Henry Kennedy of the Misdemeanor Trial Section, Washington, D. C. Courts, on September 25, 1974.

47. National Pretrial Source Book, p. 28.

48. Ibid., p. 29.

49. National Pretrial Portfolio, p. 25.

50. Ibid, p. 10.

51. Ibid., p. 29.

52. Morris, p. 134.

53. A National Strategy, p. 121, footnote 12.

54. See, for example, the honest politician's guide to crime control; Jessica Mitford, Kind and Usual Punishment, New York: Random House, 1973; Women in Prison, and the Comptroller General's "Report to Congress."

55. Most of these programs are drawn from the same source: New England Resource Center for Occupational Education and Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, The First National Sourcebook - A Guide to Correctional Vocational Training. July, 1973 (typed report under contract with the U. S. Office of Education, H.E.W.).

56. Ibid, pp. 67-8.

57. McArthur, p. 15.

58. Educational Rehabilitation Program for Dallas County Jail Inmates, An Evaluation, p. 32.

59. Stuart Adams, "Higher Learning Behind Bars," Change (November, 1973), p. 46.

60. C. Alton Laird, A Study of the College-Level Educational Program of the Texas Department of Corrections. A Dissertation presented to the College of Education, University of Houston, May 15, 1971, p. 101.

61. Adams, "Higher Learning," pp. 46 and 47.

62. Rex H. Herron, John T. Muir, and Dorsey Williams, "National Survey of Post-secondary Education Programs for Incarcerated Officenders," NewGate Resource Center, National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Hackensack, New Jersey, 1973, p. 5.

63. Ibid., p. 9.

64. President's Commission, p. 183.

65. John J. Marsh, "Higher Education in American Prisons" Crime and Delinquency Literature, Vol. 5, No. 1 (March 1973), p. 143.

66. Stuart Adams and John J. Connolly, "Role of Junior Colleges in the Prison Community," Junior College Journal, Vol. 41, No. 6 (March 1971), p. 94.

67. James P. McWilliams, "Rehabilitation Versus Recidivism," Junior College Journal, Vol. 41, No. 6 (March 1971), p. 88.

68. Herron, pp. 7-8.

69. Art German, "From Delinquency to College," (California) Youth Authority Quarterly, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Fall 1970), pp. 36-41.

70. The Office of Experimental Programs, Division of Community Education, Federal City College, p. 4.

71. Southampton Correctional Farm, Grant Application for College Release Program.

72. Letter from Mr. Ted Wallman, Superintendent, Women's Reformatory in Rockwell City, Iowa, to Mr. James R. Mahoney, dated September 13, 1974.

73. Edward J. Drury, "Inventory of Higher Education Programs in State and Federal Penal Institutions During the 1972-73 Academic Year."

74. Wallman letter.

75. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, An Exemplary Project - Community Based Corrections in Des Moines. Washington, D. C." Government Printing Office, no date, p. 9.

76. Ibid., p. 10.

77. Ibid.

78. Ibid.

79. For example, see pp. 15-16 of the Comptroller General's "Report to the Congress."

80. Herron, p. 18.

81. We are indebted to Mr. Eddie Harrison for his help in preparing the sections dealing with Community Support, Publicity, Funding, and Evaluation.

82. We are indebted to Ms. Margery Velimesis for her help in preparing the sections dealing with Publicity and Funding.

83. John M. McCartt and Thomas J. Mangogna, Guidelines and Standards for Halfway Houses and Community Treatment Centers, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, May 1973, p.64.

84. Ibid., p.65.

85. Ibid., p. 65 and p.273.

86. The material offered combines information drawn from Guidelines and discussions with Mr. Eddie Harrison, Mr. John McCollum, President of SERD, Inc., Mr. Robert Smith, of the California Youth Authority, Mr. Dennis Mulder, Director of C.O.P.E. at Montcalm College, and Ms. Margery Velimesis. Again, we wish to express our gratitude to those named for their generous help.

87. Guidelines, p.74.

88. Tully L. McCrea and Don M. Gottfredson, A Guide to Improved Handling of Misdemeanant Offenders. Davis, California: National Council on Crime and Delinquency Research Center, June 1973, p.243.

89. Community Crime Prevention, p.15

90. We are indebted to Mr. Eddie Harrison, Mr. John McCollum and particularly to Dr. Keith Baker, Social Science Analyst, Division of Educational Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for their help in preparing this section.

91. Sara M. Steele, Contemporary Approaches to Program Evaluation: Implications for Evaluating Programs for Disadvantaged Adults, Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Division, Capitol Publications, Inc., 1973 (for ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Education), p.20.

92. Ibid., p.21.

93. Ibid., p.22

94. Ibid.

APPENDIX I

LEAA GRANTS RELATING TO FIRST OFFENDERS

FISCAL YEAR 1969-1974*

*Abstracts of these grants are on file at the "AACJC" First Offender Project Office.

FISCAL YEAR 1969-71

Juvenile Understanding Service Team
Bureau County
Princeton, Illinois

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$9,000	69AS170069	069069 01 99

Intensive Intevention Project Phase I
Judiciary State of Hawaii

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$5,388	70AS150087	70A-6 3A

Residential Community Center for Selected Offenders
YMCA of Metro. Detroit
2020 Witherell
Detroit, Michigan 48226

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$43,980	70AS260426	9-06-56-0426-01

Operation Midway I
Nassau County
240 Old County Road
Mineola, New York 11501

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$68,705	70AS360183	45411

First Offender Program to Control Recidivism Amoung Juveniles
Dallas Police Department
106 S. Harwood Street
Dallas, Texas 75201

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$20,066	70AS480644	70D050644

Juvenile Community Adjustment Program
Franklin County
Courthouse
Benton, Illinois 62812

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$18,272	71AS170109	000109 01 00

Special Probation Services Project
St. Louis Juvenile Ct.
920 No. Vandeventer
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

AWARD AMOUNT	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$80,452	71AS290170	V-AC37-71-C2

Misdemeanant
City of Tulsa Municipal Criminal Court
600 Civic Center Plaza
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103

AWARD AMOUNT	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$35,000	71AS400319	71-E-21

Pre-Trial Release & Rehab. Program for Indigent 1st Offender
City of Tulsa
New Day Incorporated
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119

AWARD AMOUNT	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$36,410	71AS400321	71E31

Action for Youth-Five Rivers Campus
Mid-Cumberland Reg. L.E. Plan. AGCY.
226 Capitol Blvd..-Suite 801
Nashville, Tenn. 37219

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$105,776	71AS470398	398A-71-4.0-E

Police Legal Advisor
New Orleans Police Department
920 North Vandeventer
Juvenile Dividion
St. Louis, Missouri 63108

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
143,377	70DF290095	None

FISCAL YEAR 1972-74 with 1969 CATEGORICALS (SUB-GRANTS BY LEAA)

Frenchburg Correctional Rehabilitation Center
Kentucky Department of Corrections
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$156,560	71DF210642	None

Extra-Judicial Porbation Program for Adult Offenders
Wichita County Child Welfare Board
Wichita Falls, Texas

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$18,634	71DF480821	None

The Caine Offender Halfway House
Volusia County
P.O. Box 429
Deland, Florida 32720

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$31,725	72AS121593	72-13-09

Class II Detention & Rehabilitation Center
City of Mayfield
City Hall
Mayfield, Kentucky

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$25,000	72AS210022	874-113-172

Project F.O.U.N.D.-1st Offenders Under New Direction
Baltimore City
Baltimore, Maryland

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$150,000	72AS240089	ADJ-249-03-BC

Citizen Probation Project
Kalamazoo County
County Building
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49006

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$20,690	72AS262168	12612-1

Intensive Community Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Program
City of Camden
Courthouse Sq.
Camden, New Jersey

AWARD AMOUNT :	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$40,344	72AS340006	A-6-72

Hudson County Pretrial Intervention Project
Hudson County
Hudson Cnty Bd. of Chosen Freeholders
Jersey City, New Jersey

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
194,981	72AS340100	A-106-72

Operation Midway II
Nassau County
240 Old County Rd.
Mineola, New York 11501

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$257,434	72AS369183	59242

Pre-Trial Release
Overton Putnam White Counties
Livingston, Tenn. 38570

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$39,850	72AS470310	310A-72-11.05-V1B3

*1. First Offender School
Dane County District Attorney's Office
Madison, Wisconsin

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$9,884.	72AS551042	72-05-03-01

*2. First Offender School
Dane County
Court House
Madison, Wisconsin

AWARD AMOUNT	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$15,000	72AS551235	72-05-03-04

Police To Partners Court Diversion Project
Dept. of Institutions/Div. of Youth Service
3900 South Carr Street
Denver, Colorado 80235

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$128,236	72DF080032	None

Project Intercept
Colorado Youth Services Institute
2000 West Alameda
Denver, Colorado 80223

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$323,992	72ED08S001	None

Juvenile Officer
Randolph County
Courthouse
Pocahontas, Arizona 72455

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$5,635	73AS050065	73-065

*3. Dade County Pre-Trial Intervention Project
Dade County
Courthouse
Miami, Florida

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$100,526	73AS120035	73-21-29

Escambia County Public Defender Bail-Pre-Trial Diversion
Escambia County
200 East Government Street
Pensacola, Florida 32501

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$37,513	73AS120048	73-12-13

Five Rivers Campus-Rehab. Juveniles-Action for Youth Inc.
Mid-Cumberland Development Dist.
Suite 801
226 Capitol Blvd. Building
Nashville, Tenn.

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$50,000	73AS470049	43A-73-4.0-11

Youth Services Unit II
City of Knoxville
City Hall Park
Knoxville, Tenn.

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$27,000	73AS470094	89A-73-7.09-D4

*4. First Offender School
Dane County
Courthouse
Madison, Wisconsin

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$10,127	73AS551437	73-02-09-01

Atlanta Pre-Trial Intervention Project
Georgia Dept. of Labor
State Labor Building
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

AWARD AMOUNT	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$402,299	73ED130009	None

Juvenile Status Offender Diversion & Treatment Program
City of Virginia Beach
Civic Center
Virginia Beach, Va. 23456

AWARD AMOUNT	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$152,565	73ED510002	None

Volunteer Program
Northeast Oregon Law Enforcement Council
1100 L Avenue
La Grande, Oregon 97850

AWARD AMOUNT	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$7,025	74AS410020	74A13.6

1974 Colorado Judicial Improvement Mini-Block
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
1370 Broadway
Denver, Colorado 80203

AWARD AMOUNT	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$125,000	74DF80027	None

Blackburn Correctional Complex
Kentucky Department of Corrections
State Office Bldg.
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

AWARD AMOUNT	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$473,000	74ES210007	1169-004-C74E

APPENDIX II

LEAA GRANTS RELATING TO PRE-TRAIL RELEASE AND EDUCATIONAL RELEASE FISCAL YEAR 1972-1974*

* A few earlier categorical grants are included. Abstracts of grants listed are on file at the "AACJC" First Offender Project Office.

Inmate & Community Service Unit in County Jail (Juvenile and Adult)
Alachua County Sheriff's Department
Gainesville, Florida

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$50,000	69DF120399	None

Inmate Daily Release Program-Rehab. at the Local Level (Juvenile and Adult)
Kenton County Jail
Covington, Kentucky 41011

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$53,113	70DF210132	None

Community Correctional Facility (Adult)
County of Kent
300 Monroe, N.W.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49502

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$33,872	70DF260306	None

Women's Community Treatment Center (Adult)
Oregon Corrections Division
2575 Center Street, N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$51,734	70DF410120	None

Pre-Release Trng. for Institutionalized Delinquent Children (Juvenile)
Alabama Industrial School
Mt. Meigs, Alabama 36057

AWARD AMOUNT	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$95,364	71DF010823	None

Operation Advocate (Adult)
Inter-Agency Law Enforcement Planning Council
104 South Calhown
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

AWARD AMOUNT	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
199,819	71DF20662	None

McCoy Boy's Base (Juvenile)
Division of Youth Services
311 South Calhoun Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$59,997	71DF120759	None

The Middlesex County Sheriff's Office Program for Counseling (Adult)
Middlesex County Sheriff's Office
Trevle Cove Rd.
Billerica, Ma.

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$149,569	71DF250654	None

Project Chance, Jefferson City, Missouri (Adult)
Mo. Dept. of Probation and Parole
211 Marshall Street
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$136,502	71DF290551	None

Philcourt Pre-Trial Diversion Program (Adult)
Probation Dept., Court of Common Pleas
Room 111, City Hall
Philadephia, Pa. 19107

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$155,440	71DF420911	None

Community Resources for the Female Offender (Adult)
Dept. of Corrections
P.O. Box 766
Columbia, South Carolina 29202

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$52,616	71DF450906	

The Cain Offender Halfway House
Volusia County
P.O. Box 429
Deland, Florida 32720

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$31,725	72AS121593	72-13-09

Pilot Project for Personal Development Course
Indiana Women's Prison
401 North Randolph Street
Indianapolis, Indiana

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$2,745	72AS181650	9-77-72-F-2

Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency Service Bureau (Juvenile)
Wapello County Crime Commission
Wapello, Ia.

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$20,395	72AS190057	51-702-011-004-000-72

Community Corrections
Southwest Iowa Regional Crime Commission
City Hall
Council Bluffs, Iowa 51501

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$56,085	72AS190112	78-702-43-017-000-72

Community Corrections
Scott County Crime Commission
306 First National Building
Davenport, Ia. 52801

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$23,400	72AS190121	82-702-43-010-000-72

Corrections and Rehabilitation-Community Correction (Adult & Juvenile)
Central Iowa Area Crime Commission
265 Jewett Bldg.
Des Moines, Iowa

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$508,401	72AS190149	77-702-43-001-72

Project F.O.U. N.D.-1st Offenders Under New Direction (Adult)
Baltimore City
Baltimore, Maryland

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$150,000	72AS240089	ADJ-249-03-BC

Pre-Trial Release Project (Adult)
Genesee County
Genesee Co. Administration Bldg.
1101 Beach Street
Flint, Michigan 48502

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$25,000	72AS262008	4020-2

Jail Inmate Rehabilitation (Adult)
Berrien County Board of Commissioners
Berrien County Courthouse
St. Joseph, Michigan 49085

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$58,278	72AS262160	12445-1

Hennepin County Pre-Trial Diversion Project (Adult)
Hennepin County Board of Commissioners
Room 130 Court House
Minneapolis, Mn. 55145

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$132,173	72AS270171	14-12-20-07-109-(72)

Establishment of Juvenile Bureau Within Sheriff's Department (Juvenile)
Harrison County Bd. of Supervisors
County Courthouse
Gulfport, Ms. 39501

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$10,129	72AS280093	711751

Establishment of Juvenile Bureau within Police Department (Juvenile)
Pasacgoula Police Dept.
P.O. Box 577
Pascagoula, Ms. 39567

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$16,197	72AS280094	711752

Establishment of Juvenile Bureau
Natchez Police Dept.
Natchez, Mississippi

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$11,232	72AS280096	711754

Establishment of Juvenile Bureau
Vicksburg Police Dept.
Vicksburg, Mississippi

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$12,096	72AS280097	711755

Education Release Program (Adult)
University of Mo.
215 University Hall
Columbia, Mo. 65201

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$21,476	72AS290104	MU-AC10-82-F1

Community Education & Action to Combat Crime & Improve (Adult)
Alliance for Shaping a Safer Community
818 Olive St., $1068
St. Louis, Mo. 63101

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$14,400	72AS290132	ST.L.A.-AC1-72-11

St. Louis Co. Judicial Program (Adult & Juvenile)
St. Louis Co. Div. Adult Inst. Counc.
Rt. 1. Box 63
Chesterfield, Mo. 63017

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$26,256	72AS290201	V-AC28-72-J1

Women's Education II
City of New York
New York, New York

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$325,026	72AS360594	N/V

Singer Probation II
County of Monroe
39 W. Main Street
Rochester,New York 14614

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$708,553	72AS360873	59442

Pre-Trial Evaluation Release (Adult)
Central Piedmont C.J. Planning Agency
1229 Greenwood Cliff Suite 301
Charlotte, North Carolina 28204

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$75,000	72AS370316	06-073-272-11

Forsyth County Youth Center (Juvenile)
Piedmont Triad C.J. Planning Agency
P.O. Box 186
5506 W. Friendly Ave.
Greensboro, North Carolina 27409

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$39,678	72AS370443	33-027-172-11

NEW VIEW (Adult)
Pa Bureau of Corrections
P.O. Box 200
Camp Hill, Pa. 17011

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$376,105	72AS420162	DS-225-72A

Lincoln-Grateford Educational and Exchange Project (Adult)
City of Chester
County Courthouse
West Chester, Pa. 19380

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$3,963	72AS420219	SE-267-72A

Pre-Hearing Intensive Supervision (Juvenile)
Phila. Common Pleas Court-Family Div.
1801 Vine Street
Phila., Pa. 19103

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO.	STATE GRANT NO:
$96,992	72AS420325	PH-056-72A

ROR Program (Adult)
Common Pleas Court of Phila.
City Hall-Broad & Market St.,
Phila. Pa. 19107

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$329,582	72AS420326	PH-061-72A

Continuation of PhilCourt Pretrial Diversion Program (Adult)
Adult Prob. Dept. Court of Common Plea
714 Market Street, 6th Floor
Phila.,Pa. 19106

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$162,716	72A-420346	PH-106-72A

Challenge House: A Halfway House for Ex-Cons (Adult)
Governor's Committee on Crime
265 Melrose Street
Providence, R.I. 02907

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$81,673	72AS440075	72-1507-D (Revised)

Educational Life Enrichment (Juvenile)
Minnehaha County
Courthouse
Sioux Falls, S.D. 57101

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$11,047	72AS460054	2-03-01-702

Community-Study/Work Release Center (Adult)
South Dakota State Penitentiary
Box 911
Sioux Falls, S.D. 57100

AWARD AMOUNT	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$21,083	72AS460143	2-06-06-002

Comm-Based Correctional Prog. and Services for Adults (Adult)
Rockingham Co.
County Courthouse
Bridgewater, Va.

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$14,104	72AS510124	72-A1456

Pre-Release Services for Adult Offenders
Dept. of Welfare and Institutions
Chesterfield, Va. 23832

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$100,000	72AS510221	72-A1028

Pre-Release Services for Adult Offenders (Adult)
City of Franklin
City Hall
Franklin, Va.

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$37,750	72AS510224	72-A1450

Adult Correctional Institutions Edl. Program Study (Adult)
State Bd. for Comm. College Education
Olympia, Wa. 98504

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$16,380	72AS530655	655

Juvenile Parole Services Everett Learning Center Program (Juvenile)
The City of Everett
Everett, Washington

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$20,180	72AS530695	695

Learning Center Program (Juvenile)
City of Spokane
Spokane, Washington 99201

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$20,180	72AS530696	696

Learning Center Program (Juvenile)
City of Yakima
Yakima, Washinton

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$20,180	72AS530697	698

Learning Center Project (Juvenile)
Seattle Law & Justice Planning Office
2902 Smith Tower
Seattle, Washington 98104

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$21,940	72AS530698	698

Pre-Trial Release Program (Adult)
Division of Adult Corrections
Rd D #1, 246-1
Smyrna, De. 19977

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$116,176	72DF100014	None

Diagnostic & Treatment Serv. for Dayton Human Rehab. Ctr. (Adult)
Dayton Human Rehab. Center
1613 South Gettysburg Avenue
Dayton, Ohio 45408

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$110,000	72DF390042	None

Multi-County Juvenile Detention System-Phase III (Juvenile)
Multi-Cnty Bd. of Commissioners
Stark County Office Bldg.
209 W. Tuscarawas St.,
Canton, Ohio 44702

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$194,200	72DF90058	None

Community Residential Facility for Youth (Juvenile)
Div. of Correction
Dept. of Public Safety & Corr. Serv.
Hunt Valley, Md. 21031

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$178,719	72ED24S003	None

Middlesex Co. Sheriff's Office Prog. for Rehab. & Work Rels. (Adult)
Middlesex County Sheriff's Office
Treble Cove Rd.
Billerica, Ma.

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$90,330	72ED250007	None

Home Detention Project (Juvenile)
Juvenile Div.-Circuit Court
920 North Vandeventer
St. Louis, Mo. 63108

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$92,000	72ED29S002	None

New Mexico Project Newgate (Adult)
Eastern New Mexico University
Portales, New Mexico 88130

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$82,018	72ED350001	None

Oregon Project Newgate (Adult)
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$210,018	72ED410001	None

Inmate Rehabilitation
Kent County
300 Monroe Avenue, N.W.
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49502

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$94,140	72ES262249	9060-2

Women's Community Treatment Center
Corrections Division
2375 Center St.,N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97301

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$51,000	72ES410031	72E1

Release Training Subsidies
Oregon Corrections Division
2575 Center Street, N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$25,000	72ES410112	72E6

Coos Bay Corrections Community Center
Corrections Div.
2375 Center St. N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$22,358	72ES410126	72E5

Residential Center for Work Release Inmates (Adult)
Dept. of Health and Social Services
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$59,953	72ES551067	72-06-02-01

State Work Education Release Program (Adult)
Division of Adult Corrections
R.D. #1, Box 246-A
Smyrna, De. 19977

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$140,000	73AS100087	FA-45-73

Pre-Trail Release Program (Adult)
Div. of Adult Corrections
Wilmington, De.19805

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$64,292	73AS100090	FA-44-73

Community Based Corrections (Adult)
Polk County
100 E. Locust
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$608,872	73AS190570	702-73-04-7700-43-06

Community Based Corrections (Adult)
Pottawattamie County
County Courthouse
Council Bluffs, Iowa

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$69,134	73AS190572	702-73-02-004-43-01

Rehabilitation and Work Release (Adult)
Kenton County
303 Court St.
Covington, Kentucky 41011

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$79,201	73AS210381	113-050C73

Class I Detention and Rehabilitation Center (Adult)
Jefferson County
5th and Market Streets
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$82,495	73AS210424	1051-118-173

County Adult Correctional Program (Adult)
Suffolk County
Court House
Boston, Mass.

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$4395,000	73AS250030	73C-078.101

Pre-Court Screening Program (Adult)
Hennepin County Bd. of Commissioners
Room 130, Courthouse
Mpls. Minn. 55415

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$132,186	73AS270006	G-41-73-ADJ

Project Remand
City of St. Paul
15 W. Kellogg Blvd.
St. Paul, Minn.

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$138,455	73AS270020	3313714273

Minnesota Youth Advocate Corps. (Juvenile)
Minnesota Dept. of Education
550 Cedar St.
St. Paul, Minnesota

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$207,211	73AS270037	4318800173

Concept House Drug Abuse Treatment and Rehabilitation
City of Camden
City Hall
Camden, New Jersey 08103

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$217,250	73AS340049	A-6-73

Comprehensive Rehabilitation Program (Adult)
Mercer County
Administration Building
640 South Broad St.
Trenton, New Jersey 08607

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$96,841	73AS340056	A-34-73

Atlantic County Jail Rehabilitative Services (Adult)
Atlantic County
Mays Landing, New Jersey

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$47,463	73AS340065	A-25-73

Anti-Recidivism, County Offenders (Adult)
Middlesex County
John F. Kennedy Square
New Brunswick, New Jersey

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$182,211	73AS340126	A-64-73

Pre-Trial Services Agency (Adult)
City of New York
New York, New York

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$963,158	73AS361225	66635

Jobs For Ex-Offenders (Adult)
Dept. of Social Rehab. and Control
831 W. Morgan St.
Raleigh, North Carolina

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$56,174	73AS370044	33-033-273-13

Pre-Trial Release (Adult)
County of Mecklenburg
720 East Fourth Street
Charolotte, North Carolina 28202

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$99,495	73AS370169	06-073-373-11

Community Related Center (Adult)
Dept. of Justice-Bureau of Correction
P.O. Box 200
Camp Hill, Pa. 17011

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$40,000	73AS420158	DS-399-73A

Corrections Educational Coordinator (Adult)
Juniata College Huntington Corr. Institution
Huntington, Pa. 16652

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$22,053	73AS420644	DS-434-73A

Residential Placement for Potential Parolees (Adult)
City of Bethlehem
10 East Church Street
Bethlehem, Pa. 18018

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$58,219	73AS420833	NE-261-73A

Work Release Co-Ordinators (Adult)
Dept. of Health and Social Services
Madison, Wisconsin

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$21,300	73AS551036	73-03-01-02

Counseling and Financial Aid Offenders Post Secondary Ed.(Adult)
Higher Education Aids Board
Madison, Wisconsin

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$119,670	73AS551038	73-03-07-07

Pre-Trial Supervision Project
Bureau of Rehab. of Nat'l Capital Area
1111 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$90,141	73DF11008	None

Second Genesis Therapeutic Community (Adult)
Prince Georges County Govt.
Court House
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20870

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$67, 243	73DF240021	None

Morrisania West Inc., Postal Street Academy (Juvenile)
City and County of San Franisco
Delinquency Prevention Division
40 First Street
San Francisco, California 94105

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$150,000	73ED060018	None

Juvenile Court-Based Diversion Project (Juvenile)
Dept. of Youth Services
14 Somerset St.
Boston, Mass.

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$650,000	73ED250017	None

Jersey City Juvenile Diversion Project (Juvenile)
Dept. of Community Affairs
City Hall
280 Grove St.
Jersey City, New Jersey 07302

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$198,460	73ED340006	None

State Work Education Release Program (Adult)
Division of Adult Corrections
R. D. #1, Box 246-A
Smyrna, De. 19977

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$215,000	73ES100087	FA-45-73-, FA-E45-73

Gainesville Training and Pre-Release Center (Adult)
Depts.-Health and Rehab. Ser/Corrections
1323 Winewood Blvd.
Tallahasess, Florida

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$150,000	73ES120032	73-08-08

Community Based Treatment (Adult)
Kalamazoo County
County Building
227 W. Michigan Ave.
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49006

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$143,694	73ES260295	11344-2

Ore. Project Newgate (Adult)
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$60,000	73ES410009	73E580.1

Women's Community Treatment Center (Adult)
Oregon Corrections Div.
2575 Center St., N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97310

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$27,622	73ES410011	73E.3

Inmate Rehabilitation (Adult)
Washtenaw County
12 County Bldg.
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$92,772	74AS260008	12624-2

Citizens Probation Authority (Adult)
Kalamazoo County
Kalamazoo County Bldg.
227 W. Michigan Avenue
Kalamazoo, Michigan

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$116,065	74AS260009	12612-2

Reintegration of Legal Offenders-Sidney (Adult)
Nebraska Penal and Correctional Complex
P.O. Box 81248
Lincoln, Ne. 68501

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT:
$141,490	74AS310035	74-27

Northeast Region Correctional Center (Adult)
Probation Dept. - St. Louis County
St. Louis County Courthouse
Duluth, Minnesota

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$124,326	74ED270023	None

Salt Lake Area Community Corrections Project (Adult)
Salt Lake County Bd. of Commissioners
City and County Bldg.
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$400,000	74ED490010	None

Evaluation of Community-Based Programs for Adult Offenders (Adult)
Florida State University
Graduate Studies and Research
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$278,540	74N1120051	None

Des Moines Replication in San Mateo County (Adult)
San Mateo County
Hall of Justice and Records
Redwood City, Calif. 94063

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$250,000	74TA060001	None

Replication of Des Moines Community-Based Corrections Program (Adult)
Parish of East Baton Rouge
P.O. Box 1471
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70801

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$238,519	74TA220001	None

Salt Lake Area Community Corrections Project (Adult)
Salt Lake County Bd. of Commissioners
City and County Bldg.
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$250,000	74TA490001	None

Clark County Community Corrections Project (Adult)
Clark County Bd. of Commissioners
Clark County Courthouse
1200 Franklin St.
Vancouver, Washington 98660

AWARD AMOUNT:	LEAA GRANT NO:	STATE GRANT NO:
$250,000	74TA530001	None

APPENDIX III

HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

IN STATE AND FEDERAL PENAL INSTITUTIONS

DURING THE 1972-73 ACADEMIC YEAR*

*This list is adopted from the Inventory prepared by Edward J. Drury for the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs at the University of Minnesota. Mr. Drury points out that "there is no claim that the inventory is complete." A copy of Mr. Drury's Inventory is on file at the "AACJC" First Offender Project Office.

ALABAMA

No response.

ALASKA

No response.

ARIZONA

Central Arizona College, Coolidge, Arizona.

ARKANSAS

No response.

CALIFORNIA

California has a number of different college-level educational programs at various penal institutions.

During the fall of 1972, there were forty-nine parolees attending California State University at Los Angeles.

COLORADO

University of Colorado, Denver, Colorado.

The University of Colorado has a Project Newgate program. During the fall of 1972 there were forty-two students enrolled in Newgate at the Federal Youth Center in Denver with seven students on study release to attend classes on the University campus. This is federally funded and is a formal program offering a full range of lower-division college courses.

Colorado Mountain College, Salida, Colorado

Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colorado

Southern Colorado State College, Pueblo, Colorado

CONNECTICUT

Manchester Community College, Manchester, Connecticut

North Central Community College, Enfield, Connecticut

North Central Community College is a new college which now has a pilot program which started in January of 1973 involving the penal institution at Enfield. Qualifed inmates are enrolled on campus as regular students on a part-time basis during morning hours.

Quinnepaic College, Hamden, Connecticut

The State of Connecticut Department of Corrections enters into contracts with various private colleges and state community colleges for college-level istruction for specific courses to be given during a particular period of time. The Department of Corrections has proposed a college-level academic program of some kind for each penal institution in the state.

DELAWARE

University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Federal City College

As a student completes the institutional course offerings, he may be transported daily to the City College campus.

FLORIDA

Central Florida Community College, Ocala, Florida

South Florida Junior College, Avon Park, Florida

Students from Avon Park are allowed to attend classes at the college campus and, during the 1972-73 academic year, there were approximately fifteen inmate students taking full-time academic or vocational training programs on campus.

The Community Colleges in Florida offer many college-level courses in correctional institutions throughout the State.

GEORGIA

University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia

South Georgia College, Douglas, Georgia

Brewton-Parker College, Mt. Vernon, Georgia

HAWAII

University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii

IDAHO

Boise State College, Boise, Idaho

Several inmate students attended Boise State College on a full-time basis at the campus on a study release program. The students are transported to the college from the penal institution but the state of Idaho is in the process of establishing a community treatment center which would enable the study release students to reside outside the penal institution.

ILLINOIS

Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois

Chicago City College System, Chicago, Illinois

Wilbur Wright College, Chicago, Illinois

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois

INDIANA

Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana

A few of inmates have been allowed to enroll in regular on-campus courses at Indiana State on a study release basis.

Vincennes University Junior College, Vincennes, Indiana

IOWA

Iowa Central Community College, Ft. Dodge, Iowa

Some inmate students attend college on campus at Iowa Central College in Ft. Dodge. The penal institution pays the fees for students taking courses at the college campus.

Southeastern Community College, West Burlington, Iowa

Kirkwood Community College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa

Some inmate students have attended classes on the Kirkwood campus and there are still provisions for doing that but study release is used and there is a halfway house in Cedar Rapids for that purpose.

KANSAS

Hutchinson Community Junior College, Hutchinson, Kansas

Five inmate students are involved in the on-campus study program. The men are taken to the campus at 7 a.m. and remain until noon. The institution pays all expenses except for those individuals on the G.I. Bill.

University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas

Kansas City Kansas Community College, Kansas City, Kansas

KENTUCKY

University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky

Western Kentucky University, Bowling, Green, Kentucky

Murray State University, Murray, Kentucky

LOUISIANA

Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

MAINE

University of Maine, Augusta, Maine

Several inmates attend classes through a study release program at the University campuses at Augusta, Portland-Gorham and Orono.

MARYLAND

University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

Community College of Baltimore, Maryland

Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland

Hagerstown Junior College

In the fall term, there were thirty-nine men involved in the college program, eight of whom commuted to the campus at Hagerstown Junior College on a study release program.

MASSACHUSETTS

Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts

Boston University does not offer a formal educational program at a correctional institution. However, Professor Elizabeth J. Barker of the English Department has taught college-level academic courses for credit at the Massachusetts Correctional Institution at Norfolk. These courses are taught on a volunteer basis.

Bristol Community College, Fall River, Massachusetts

MICHIGAN

Jackson Community College, Jackson, Michigan

About one hundred fifty of these students were attending as on-campus students in night classes in vocational studies.

Washtenaw Community College, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Montcalm Community College, Sidney, Michigan

MINNESOTA

Antioch College, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Augsburg College, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Classes are held at the penal institutions except for an occasional class where inmates, staff and students meet on the Augsburg campus.

MINNESOTA (CONT'D)

Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota

Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

The general College operates an on-campus program under an agency called the Consolidated (HELP) Center (Higher Education for Low Income Persons). No courses are offered at penal institutions. The program serves approximately nine hundred students, and of these, approximately seventy-five are ex-offenders. Most of these students receive some financial aid and the Consolidated HELP Center is housed in a building where students may meet and where counsellors are available.

The university has a Project Newgate program which has been operating since fall quarter of 1969. Newgate has several programs involving inmates at the St. Cloud Reformatory, the Minneapolis Workhouse and ex-offenders, both on study release and on parole, at the Newgate House on the university campus.

Project Newgate purchased a fraternity house on the university campus where inmate students live after release from the institution while they attend classes at the university. Counsellors are available at all times and the peer group therapy continues.

MISSISSIPPI

None

MISSOURI

University of Missouri, Rolla, Missouri

University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri

Moberly Junior College, Moberly, Missouri

MONTANA

University of Montana, Missoula, Montana

NEBRASKA

Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebraska

York Junior College, York, Nebraska

The state of Nebraska has an education release program which is coordinated with the University of Nebraska and the Lincoln Technical College.

NEVADA

Western Nevada Community College, Carson City, Nevada

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Franconia College, Franconia, New Hampshire

Beginning in September, 1973 selected inmates nearing parole will be released to participate fully in the on-campus academic program at Franconia College. The students will reside in Franconia and a major portion of their living expenses and tuition will be paid by the Vocational Rehabilitation unit at the state prison. Franconia College will provide part of the student tuition from scholarship funds.

NEW JERSEY

Somerset County College, Somerville, New Jersey

A study release project has been developed whereby students from both Annandale and Clinton attend classes during the day at the Somerset College campus.

Mercer County Community College, Trenton, New Jersey

Trenton State College, Trenton, New Jersey

Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, New Jersey

Montclair State College does not offer regular college-level academic courses to students in correctional institutions but does have an extensive program for getting inmate students out of the institution and onto the college campus.

NEW MEXICO

Eastern New Mexico University, Portales, New Mexico

College of Santa Fe, Santa, Fe, New Mexico

There is a study release program where students, both male and female, to to the campus during the day and return to the institution during the evening.

NEW YORK

Dutchess Community College, State University of New York, Poughkeepsie, New York

Some inmate students attend college at the campus under a study release program and some parolees are taking classes at the campus.

The John Jay College of Criminal Justice, The City University of New York, New York

This college has education programs for inmates of correctional institutions, and, as a follow-through, programs for ex-offenders at the campus.

State University College, New Paltz, New York

State University College of Arts and Science, Plattsburgh, New York

For the first time during the fall semester of 1972, three inmates were released during the day to attend classes on Plattsburgh campus.

Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York

Upon parole, a select number of students would continue as full-time Syracuse University students in residence. One part of the proposal provides for a halfway house near the campus with counselling and tutoring staffs.

NORTH CAROLINA

This state has a study release program by many colleges at correctional centers but the extent of participation and enrollment of inmates is not known.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mary College, Bismarck, North Dakota

OHIO

Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio

Wilmington College, Wilmington, Ohio

The University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio

OKLAHOMA

None

OREGON

University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon

Project Newgate is the only program offering residents an opportunity to live on campus and take courses.

PENNSYLVANIA

Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania

University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Community College of Allegheny County, Pittsburgh, Penna.

Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pennsylvania

PUERTO RICO

None

RHODE ISLAND

No response

SOUTH CAROLINA

University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina

SOUTH DAKOTA

Sioux Falls Continuing Education Center

TENNESSEE

University of Tennessee, Nashville, Tennessee

TEXAS

All fourteen units of the Texas state prison system are under one administration and the college academic and vocational program is administered through the Texas Department of Corrections.

About eighty students are transferred to the Alvin Junior College campus on Saturday mornings.

UTAH

None

VERMOUNT

Community College of Springfield, Vermount

VIRGINIA

Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia

WASHINGTON

The University of Washington

Everett Community College

The Walla Walla Community College

WEST VIRGINIA

Bethany College, Bethany, West Virginia

Davis and Elkins College, Elkins, West Virginia

West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia

WISCONSIN

University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, Oshkosh, Wisconsin

Approximately one hundred state and federal probationers and parolees were enrolled as full-time students at the Oshkosh campus during academic year 1972-73.

Unversity of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Wisconsin

University of Wisconsin-Green Bay, Green Bay, Wisconsin

In the spring of 1972, a study release program was initiated in which five men were placed in a halfway house and attended the university as full-time students.

St. Norbert College, West De Pere, Wisconsin

University of Wisconsin-Marathon County Center, Wausau, Wisconsin

The Wisconsin Home for Women now has four women enrolled in a full academic program on campus at the Fond du Lac campus of the University of Wisconsin.

The University of Wisconsin System has a Task Force on Corrections and the Higher Education System which issued a report calling for more involvement by the University of Wisconsin at its many campuses in the field of education at Wisconsin correctional institutions.

The report calls for the establishment of halfway houses near university campuses.

WYOMING

None

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. ARTICLES, BOOKS, AND SPEECHES

Adams, Stuart N., "CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION: STATUS AND PROSPECTS," Washington, D. C., April, 1973

Adams, Stuart N., "COLLEGE-LEVEL INSTRUCTION IN U.S. PRISONS- AN EXPLORATORY SURVEY." School of Criminology, University of California, January 1968.

Adams, Stuart N., "HIGHER LEARNING BEHIND BARS," Change (November, 1973), 45-50.

Adams, Stuart and Connolly, John J., "ROLE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES IN THE PRISON COMMUNITY," Junior College Journal, Vol. 41, No. 6 (March, 1971), 92-98.

Adams, William P., Chander, Paul M., and Neithercutt, M.G., "THE SAN FRANCISCO PROJECT: A CRITIQUE," Federal Probation, 35 (December, 1971), 45-53

American Bar Association Project on Minimun Standards for Criminal Justice, Standards Relating to Post-Conviction Remedies. New York: American Bar Association, "Approved Draft, 1968"

American Bar Association Project on Standards for Criminal Justice, Standards Relating to Probation - New York: American Bar Association "Approved Draft 1970."

American Bar Association Project on Standards for Criminal Justice, Standards Relating to Sentencing Alternatives and Procedures. New York: American Bar Association, "Approved Draft, 1968"

American Friends Service Committee, Struggle for Justice - A Report on Crime and Punishment in America. New York: Hill & Wang, 1971.

Baker, William H., "From the Community Colleges, A Response," Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Spring 1972), 97-9.

Beran, Nancy J. and Allen, Harry E., "Shock Probation: The Ohio Experience." Columbus, Ohio: The Program for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, October, 1973.

Berthelf, Minerva J., "The Development of a Two-Year College Program for a California Correctional Institution" (typed copy) (no Date).

Blackwell, Jr., Paul Houston, Higher Education in Prison: A Study of the Impact of College Education Upon Selected Inmates of Draper Correctional Center, Elmore, Alabama. A Dessertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Auburn University, 1973.

Blake, Sallie, et al, "The Holmesburg Project: A case Study in Community," Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Spring 1972), 94-5

Burkhart, Kathryn Watterson, Women in Prison. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1973

Case, John D., "Citizen Participation: An Experiment in Prison-Community Relations," Federal Probation, Vol. 30, No. 4 (December, 1966), 18-24.,

Cassell, Richard E.,"Educating Minorities in a Correctional Environment." Speech made at the Sixth Annual Library Workshop, October 1, 1971.

Cassleman, Jane and Blake, Sallie M., " Community College of Philadelphia at Holmesburg Prison," Journal of Research and Development in Education. Vol. 5, No. 3 (Spring 1972) 99-103.

Chandler, Edna Walker, Women in Prison. Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973.

Clements, Raymond D., Para-Professionals in Probation and Parole: A Manual for their Selection, Training, Induction and Supervision in Day-to-Day Tasks - Chicago: Center for Studies in Criminal Justice, The Law School, University of Chicago, July 1, 1972.

Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, H.R. 9007 (Programs of Community Supervision and Services), June 27, 1973.

Comptroller General of the U.S., "Report to the Congress - Rehabilitating Inmates of Federal Prisons: Special Programs Help, But Not Enough." Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1973

Davenport, Marilyn, "Working with the Female Offender," In Proceedings of the 101st Annual Congress of the American Correctional Association, Miami Beach. Florida, 1971

Division of Manpower Development and Training, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, Office of Education, H.E.W., "Fiscal Year 1974 -- Correctional Institution Training Projects -- Annual Report."

Drury, Edward J.,"Inventory of Higher Education Programs In State and Federal Penal Institutions During the 1972 - 73 Academic Year." (typed, no date)

Empey, Lamar T., "Alternatives to Incarceration" Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Flynn, Edith Elizabeth, "The Special Problems of Female Offenders," in We Hold These Truths: Report of the National Conference on Corrections. Richmond: Virginia Division of Justice and Crime Prevention, 1972, pp. 113-117.

Friedman, Lucy N. and Zeisel, Hans, "First Annual Research Report on Supported Employment." (New York): Vera Institute of Justice, October 1973.

German, Art, "From Delinquency to College," (California) Youth Authority Quarterly, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Fall, 1970), 36-41.

Glaser, Daniel, "From Revenge to Resocialization: Changing Perspectives in Combating Crime," The American Scholar, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Autumn, 1971) 654-661.

Grant, Frank A., An Experimental Approach to Adult Offenders (from 1962 to 1968). Huntsville, Texas: Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences, Sam Houston State University (no date)

Greenfield, Richard K., "The College Goes to Prison," Junior College Journal, Vol. 42, No. 7 (April, 1972), 17-20.

Hayes, Mary, "University Year for Action - Administration of Justice Projects," (mimeographed) (Prepared for OPPD Justice Task Force), February, 1974.

Hendrix, Omar, "A Study in Neglect: A Report on Women Prisoners," New York: The Women's Prison Association, July 15, 1972 - October 15, 1972

"Higher Education and Criminal Justice - Assuming a Mutual Responsibility" (Proceedings of a working conference sponsored by the NewGate Resource Center National Council on Crime and Delinquency, at the Wingspread Facilities, Johnston Foundation, Racine, Wisconsin, January 21-24, 1974).

Kass, W.A., Koslin, E.M., and Schlitt, R.E., Magdala Foundation Residency Program (mimeographed), September, 1973.

Kerle, Ken, "Correctional Officer - Inmate Education -- A Communication Model." a speech before the American Correctional Association Congress, Houston, Texas, August, 1974.

Kerle, Kenneth E., "Educating Prisoners," New Society (5 July 1973), 13-15.

Kerl, Ken, "Education--Penal Institutions: U.S. and Europe," a speech delivered at the Institute on Action Research and Justice Management, The American University, October 31, 1973 (revised May, 1974).

Kerl, Ken, "A Look at Some European Prison Education Programs," Journal of Correctional Education, Vol. 26, No. 1 (Winter, 1974) 7-9.

Laird, C. Alton, A Study of the College-Level Educational Program of the Texas Department of Corrections. A Dissertation Presented to the College of Education, University of Houston, May 15, 1971.

Leeke, William D., "Correctional Education and Training in South Carolina," Correctional Education, Vol. 25, No.1 (Winter, 1973), 24-28.

Leiberg, Leon, Mutual Agreement Program: A Planned Change in Correctional Service Delivery, American Correctional Association, 1974.

Marsh, John J., "GED Testing in State Penal Institutions," Correctional Education, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Winter, 1973) 13-23.

Marsh, John J., "Higher Education in American Prisons," Crime and Delinquency Literature, Vol 5, No. 1 (March, 1973), 139-155.

McArthur, Virginia A., From Convict to Citizen: Programs for the Woman Offender. Washington, D. C.: D.C. Commission on the Status of Women, June, 1974.

McCabe, M. Patrick, and Driscoll, Brian, "College Admission Opportunities and the Public Offender." Presented to the American Association of College Admission Counsellors, San Francisco, California, September 30, 1971.

McCartt, John M. and Mangogna, Thomas J., Guidelines and Standards for Halfway Houses and Community Treatment Centers. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, May 1973. (Prepared for the U.S. Dept. of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Technical Assistance Division)

McCollum, Sylvia, "Human Concerns for the Offender," Correctional Education, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Winter, 1973) 5-11.

McCollum, Sylvia G., "New Designs for Correctional Education and Training Programs," Federal Probation (June 1973), 6-11.

McCollum, Sylvia G., The Potential of New Educational Delivery Systems for Correctional Treatment (a correctional education handbook), April, 1973.

McCrea, Tully L. and Gottfredson, Don M., A Guide to Improved Handling of Misdemeanant Offenders. Davis, California: National Council on Crime and Delinquency Research Center, June, 1973.

McWilliams, James P., "Rehabilitation Versus Recidivism," Junior College Journal, Vol. 41, No. 6 (March, 1971), 88 and 90.

Memorandum for all Assistant Attorneys General, Heads of Offices and Bureaus and All United States Attorneys of the Department of Justice; Subject: Pre-Trial Diversion. July 25, 1974.

Mitford, Jessica, Kind and Usual Punishment. New York: Random House (A Vintage Book), 1973, 1974.

Morris, Norval and Hawkins, Gordon, the honest politician's guide to crime control. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Nagel, William G., The New Red Barn: A Critical Look at the Modern American Prison. New York: Walker and Company (published for the American Foundation, Inc.), 1973.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Community Crime Prevention. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Corrections. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Reynolds, E. Andrew, "Saint Gabriel's Hall, Youth Rehabilitation Facility," Correctional Education, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Winter, 1973-74), 29-32.

Roberts, Albert R., ed. Readings in Prison Education. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Roberts, Albert R., Sourcebook on Prison Education - Past, Present, and Future. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1971.

Robertson, J.A., "Pre-Trial Diversion of Drug Offenders - A Statutory Approach," Boston University Law Review, Vol. 52, No. 2 (Spring, 1972), 335 - 71.

Rothman, David J., The Discovery of the Asylum - Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1971.

Rovner - Piezenik, Roberta, "A Review of Manpower R & D Projects in the Correctional Field (1963-1973)." (Manpower Research Monograph No.28). Washington, D.C.: Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1973.

Scheier, Ivan H., "Volunteer Programs in Prevention and Diversion - a Directory Prepared by the National Information Center on Volunteerism, Inc." Office of Youth Development, Office of Human Development, H.E.W., August, 1973.

"The Singer Approach to Rehabilitation," Correctional Education, Vol 25., No. 1 (Winter, 1973), 33-38.

Steele, Sara M., Contemporary Approaches to Program Evaluation: Implications for Evaluating Programs for Disadvantaged Adults. Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Division, Capitol Publications, Inc., 1973. (for ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Education)

Studt, Elliot, "The Rerentry of the Offender into the Community" Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Hearing Before the Subcommittee on S. 798 (The Community Supervision and Services Act), March 27, 1973.

"Summary of Major Features - MA (Manpower Administration) Offender Rehabilitation Program, Fiscal Year 1975."

Treatment of Women Offenders in the District of Columbia. Washington, D.C.: Citizens' Council for Criminal Justice, 1972.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Courts. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office. 1973.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Criminal Justice System, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, A National Strategy to Reduce Crime. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Police. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973

National Advisory Council on Extension and Continuing Education, "College Level Programs for Prisoners," from 7th Annual Report and Recommendations.

National Conference on Pretrial Release and Diversion, Notebook, San Francisco, California, June 24-28, 1974

National Pretrial Intervention Service Center, American Bar Association, Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, Monograph on Legal Issues and Charateristics of Pretrial Intervention Programs. Washington, D.C., April, 1974

National Pretrial Intervention Service Center, American Bar Association, Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, Portfolio of Descriptive Profiles on Selected Pretrial Criminal Justice Intervention Programs. Washington, D. C., April 1974.

National Pretrial Intervention Service Center, American Bar Association, Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services, Source Book in Pretrial Criminal Justice Intervention Techniques and Action Programs. Washington, D. C. May, 1974

Nelle, Susan V., editor, "The Role of Community Colleges in Corrections, An Emerging Partnership" (Proceedings of a working conference conducted by the Educational - Hubilitation Project of the State Board for Community College Education and the Office of Adult Probation and Parole of the Department of Social and Health Services, June 28-29, 1973). State of Washington: State Board for Community College Education, 1973.

New England Resource Center for Occupational Education and Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, The First National Sourcebook - A Guide to Correctional Vocational Training. July 1973 (typed report under Contract with the Office of Education, HEW).

Nimmer, Raymond T., Diversion - The Search for Alternative Forms of Prosecution. Chicago: The American Bar Foundation, 1974.

O'Hare, Patrick, "Establishing Standards for Education Programs," (California) Youth Authority Quarterly, Vol. 25, No. 4 (Winter, 1972), 38-44.

Trepodi, Tony, Fellin, Phillip, and Epstein, Irwin, Social Program Evaluation - Guidelines for Health, Education and Welfare Administration. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971.

Velimesis, Marcery L., Report on the Survey of 41 Pennsylvania County Court and Correctional Services for Women and Girl Offenders, Jan. 1, 1965-Dec. 31, 1966. Section One: The Women, The Jails, and Probation. Philadelphia: American Association of University Women and Pennsylvania Program for Women and Girl Offenders, Inc., April. 1969.

Webster's Third International Dictionary - Unabridged. Springfield, Massachusetts: G. and C. Merriam Company, 1971.

Women's Prisons Association, "History of the Women's Prisons Association" (typed) (no date)

Zimring, Franklin E., "Measuring the Impact of Pretrial Diversion from the Criminal Justice System," The University of Chicago Law Review Vol. 41, No. 2 (Winter, 1974) 224-241.

II. INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS:

Auburn State Prison (New York). Evaluation of a College Level Program (with Auburn Community College) 1. Research Proposal (on file)

Dallas County Jail: (Texas) Educational Rehabilitation Program for Dallas County Jail Inmates - An Evaluation (on file)

Department of Correctional Services (New York). Experimental Community Treatment Facilities for Earlier Paroles 1. Sheet on Parole Resource Center--Long Island University (on file) 2. Sheet describing ECTFEP (on file)

Department of Corrections (Tennessee) Project First Offender (Memphis) 1. Data for Project (1973-74) (on file) 2. Narrative Statement: Budget Request (2/20/74) (on file) 3. Forms: Volunteer Data Sheet, Training Evaluation, Volunteer, Client Data Sheet, Probation Order and Conditions, Volunteer Registration, Probationer Data Sheet, Imaginal Education Training Weekend Evaluation, (on file) 4. Description of program (on file) 5. Description of City Court Probation (on file) 6. Description of The Project First Offender Volunteer (on file) 7. The Volunteer Manual (on file) 8. Brochures on Thresholds and Citizen Volunteer Program for 1st Offender Project (on file)

Department of Court Services, Des Moines, Iowa. A Coordinated Approach to the Improved Handling of Adult Offenders. National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, An Exemplary Project - Community Based Corrections in Des Moines, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office. (on file) (no date)

Draper Correctional Center (Alabama) 1. Rehabilitation Research Foundation, Draper Correctional Center, "Proposals for Phase III, The Experimental Manpower Laboratory for Corrections." 2. How to With PI - A Systematic Approach to the Use of Programmed Instruction - the Draper Project Final Report, Vol. III, 1968.

Des Moines Area Community College (Iowa) Involvement In: Community Corrections, Riverview Release Center, Mid-Iowa Drug Abuse Council, Polk County Jail (proposed). Report on involvement (on file)

Education Department of Florida. Correctional Institution. Description of Programs (on file)

Federal Youth Center (Ashland, Kentucky). Educational Development Center, Federal Youth Center, Ashland Model for Program Effectiveness.

Hennepin County Court Services (Minnesota). Neighborhood Probation Services (The Bakery) 1. Letter from Gary Meitz, Director, 9/13/74 (on file) 2. Summary of Federal/State Grant Proposal for Hennepin County Board of Commissioners (on file) 3. The Research News, 8/7/74 (on file) 4. Pamphlet on the Bakery (on file)

Huntingdon Correctional Institution (Pennsylvania).College level program for inmates and staff at Juniata College. Subgrant Application (on file)

Lorton (Washington, D.C.). Higher Education for Men.Description of program as made by The Office of Experimental Programs, Division of Community Education, Federal City College (on file)

Magdala Foundation (Missouri). Establishment of Two Centers: One for Women and One for Men. Subgrant Application (on file)

Maricopa County Sheriff's Department (Arizona). Training County jail inmates at Maricopa County Skill Center on a "buy-in" basis. 1. Ltr. to Director, Community College of American Samoa, Describing Program (8/22/74) (on File) 2. Article from The Arizona Republic, (8/2/74) (on file)

Maryland Correctional Training Center (Hagerstown). American Vocational Research Corporation, A Report on Training and Education for the Maryland Correctional Training Center, Hagerstown, Maryland, Washington, D.C.: March, 1971.

Milan, Michigan and Terre Haute, Indiana. Columbus Laboratories, Battelle Memorial Institute, An Analysis of the Education and Training Systems at Milan, Michigan and Terre Haute, Indiana - Final Report (April 15, 1968)

NewGate. 1. Descriptive Booklet - University of Minnesota's NewGate Community Program (4/73) (on file) 2. "NewGate Directory" (Summer, 1973) (on file) 3. "New Hope Trhough Education" (on file) 4. "NewGate Model" (on file) 5. "National Survey of Postsecondary Education Programs for Incarcerated Offenders" (by Rex H. Herron, John T. Muir, and Dorsey Williams) (1973) (on file) 6. Marshall Kaplan, Gans, and Kahn, An Evaluation of "NewGate" and Other Prisoner Education Programs - Final Report (April 1973) (for the Office of Economic Opportunity) on file).

N.E. Penal and Correctional Complex (Lincoln, Nebraska). Reintegration of Legal Offenders - Sidney. Grant Application (on file).

Oregon Corrections Division. Women's Community Treatment Center. Grant Application (on file).

Pretrial Services Agency (New York City). Pretrial Release. 1. Description of Agency and Services (on file). 2. Ltr. from Perman Glenn describing Supervised Released Section (9/9/74) (on file).

Project Crossroads (Washington, D. C.). Pretrial program for participants recruited from the Juvenile and General Sessions (adult) Courts of Washington, D. C. 1. Holahan, John F., A Benefit-Cost Analysis of Project Crossroads (12/70) (on file). 2. Rovner-Pieczenik, Roberta, Project Crossroads as Pre-Trial Intervention, A Program Evaluation (12/70) (on file). Leiberg, Leon G., Project Crossroads, A Final Report to the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor (1971) (on file).

St. Louis University, Center for Urban Programs (Missouri). Regional Institute on Community Residential Treatment Centers. Grant Application (on file).

Southampton Correctional Farm: (Virginia) College Release Program. 1. Grant Application (on file) 2. Semi-Annual Narrative Report (on file) 3. Evaluation of College Release Program by Hugh Nugent, (on file)

State Correctional Institution at Pittsburg (Pennsylvania).Comrehensive Postsecondary Education Program. Subgrant Application (on file)

State Correctional Institution at Rockview (Pennsylvania). Educational Program New View 1. Subgrant Application (on file) 2. Quarterly Progress Report I (July, August, Sept., 1971) (on file) 3. Quarterly Progress Report II (Oct., Nov., Dec., 1971) (on file)

Washington County Jail (Virginia). Rehabilitation for Jail Inmates and Ex-Inmates. 1. Grant Application (on file). 2. Narrative Report on Program (on file)

Washington, D.C. Jail. Jacobs, Ann, et al, The Educational Program of the D.C. Jail; Analysis and Recommendations. Washington, D.C.: District of Columbia Department of Corrections, 1971.

Wisconsin Higher Education Aids Board. Ex-Offender Student Financial Aid and Information Program (for postsecondary education). Grant Proposal (on file)

Women's House of Detention on Riker's Island (New York). Education of Women Offenders. Attachment "A" of Grant Award Program (on file)

Women's Prison Association (New York City). Women Offenders - Facilities and Programs. 1. Description of Hopper Home (on file) 2. Description of Hopper Home for Incoming Residents (on file). 3. Profile of "Open Door" Project (on file). 4. "Children of Offenders Project" - Progress Report #3 (6/72-6/73) (on file)

Women's Reformatory (Rockwell City, Iowa). Involvement in Community Colleges. Ltr. from Mr. Ted Wallman, Superintendent, re: programs. (9/13/74) (on file)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 13 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES